

**REPORT OF
THE BOARD OF VISITORS,
NATIONAL DEFENSE UNIVERSITY MEETING
Held on October 27, 2022**



**A public meeting was held on October 27, 2022 by the Board of Visitors,
National Defense University in Marshall Hall, Room 155, Fort McNair,
Washington DC, 20319**

Date of this Report: November 30, 2022



Norton A. Schwartz, General, USAF (Ret.)
Chair

**National Defense University
Board of Visitors Meeting
October 27, 2022
MINUTES**

The National Defense University Board of Visitors (BOV) met on October 27, 2022.
The attendance roster and agenda are attached in Appendix A and B.

**0900 Call to Order
 Dr. John Yaeger, Designated Federal Officer (DFO)**

Dr. John Yaeger:

- Good morning. I am John Yaeger, the Designated Federal Officer for the Board of Visitors (BOV), National Defense University (NDU) under the provisions of Public Law 92-463. I would like to welcome everyone to today's Board meeting.

- NDU'S Board of Visitors is chartered under the authority of the Secretary of Defense to provide "independent advice and recommendations on the overall management and governance of NDU in achieving its mission." NDU's senior leaders are present to address issues, answer questions or to clarify information, as well as to listen to the board's recommendations.

- This meeting is open to the public from now until 1600, which is 4:00 PM, this afternoon, 27 October 2022.

- The University appreciates the significant and conscientious time and work of our Board members in preparing for this meeting and for their forthcoming deliberations. I and the Board would also like to thank my NDU colleagues for all their efforts and the support of the NDU Foundation in preparing for this meeting.

Some Boilerplate:

- As the DFO, I serve as the liaison between the Board and the Department of Defense. I am also responsible for ensuring all provisions of the Federal Advisory Committee Act (FACA) are met regarding the operations of the BOV.

- Also, in my role as DFO for the Board, a critical responsibility is to ensure that all appropriate ethics regulations are satisfied. In that capacity, all Board members have been briefed on the provisions of the Federal Conflict of Interest Laws. In addition, each Board participant has filed a standard government financial disclosure report. I, along with our Chief of Counsel for NDU have reviewed these reports to ensure all ethics requirements are met.

For the Meeting Operations:

- Public observation of NDU Board of Visitors meeting is in person.

- Pursuant to the Federal Advisory Committee Act of 1972, written statements to the Board of Visitors may be submitted at any time by email or fax to Ms. Joycelyn Stevens at e-mail address bov@ndu.edu or Fax (202) 685-3920. Any written statements will be distributed to the Board of Visitors, National Defense University in the order received.

- All comments received will be preserved as public records of the meeting.
- Copies of all meeting materials and public comments will be available on the NDU BOV website.

Now, I need to mention the importance of using your microphones:

We have three members participating virtually and an audience that needs to hear what is being discussed. Please ensure that your green light is on and speak into the microphone.

In Closing,

Again, I wish to thank the Board for your participation in today's meeting. And with that, Mr. Chairman, The Board of Visitors, National Defense University is hereby called to order in accordance with the provisions of Public Law 92-463.

**0900-0905 Administrative Notes
General Norton Schwartz, USAF (Retired), BOV Chair**

Gen (Ret.) Norton Schwartz:

Dr. Yaeger, again thank you so much and for the NDU team for preparing for this important endeavor that we have before us today. First of all, let me welcome those members of the Board that are here with us today: Ambassador Myrick, Ambassador Roemer, Vice Admiral Breckinridge, Lt. General Cooper, Colonel Marcos, and the Honorable Debra Wada. And remotely I know we have Dr. Howard, Dr. Logan, and Dr. Patil. And so, to all of you, again, sincere thanks for devoting your efforts and your time to this undertaking which is so vital to the future of our Armed Forces. We also have the Executive team from NDU here today. Welcome all. We appreciate the work that each of you do to make this University the crown jewel that it is, and I'd also like to offer a special welcome to Brigadier General McBurnette from Joint Forces Staff College (JFSC) who we will visit in the next cycle in Norfolk but importantly, another vital component of the National Defense University. Welcome, Sir.

And if I might take a moment, please allow me to acknowledge that one of the greats—you know sadly there are fewer giants in our midst than perhaps in the past—but a couple of days ago one of those giants passed away, and that was Ash Carter. Many of you know he was an intellectual powerhouse. He was a wonderful leader in the national security enterprise over many years. But importantly I say, and I know that Stephanie knows this, that Ash Carter invested in so many people in this room and elsewhere, and we were better for his service and for his friendship. I just would like to say again, on behalf of the Board and certainly this Institution in which he invested personal time and effort, we will miss Dr. Ash Carter. With that, we move on to the *State of the University*. Thank you.

**0905-0955 State of the University Address
Lieutenant General Michael T. Plehn, NDU President**

Lt Gen Michael Plehn:

Good morning, ladies and gentlemen. I am Lt. General Mike Plehn, the President of the National Defense University. To our esteemed Chair, Vice Chair, and Members of the Board, the NDU team and I are pleased to welcome you back to the National Defense University.

Today, we look forward to updating you on our key initiatives and accomplishments resulting from our determined focus on our university's three Lines of Effort, which are designed to: 1) Enable Student, Alumni, and Stakeholder success; 2) Improve our University, and; 3) Develop our Team. As a quick preview of what you will hear today, I would tell you we are making significant progress across the

board. Our efforts continue to focus on improving NDU's organizational health and capacity, modernizing the NDU support infrastructure, and growing as a learning organization whose decisions are data-based and data-driven. We've made significant strides since your last meeting in May, particularly with increasing NDU's personnel end-strength and executing NDU's facility investment strategy.

We successfully completed Academic Year 2021-2022 in June of this year, graduating more than 660 students from our Joint Professional Military Education Level II in-residence master's degree programs. For the entirety of Fiscal Year 2022 (which ended on September 30th), we also graduated more than 760 joint warfighters from our Joint and Combined Warfighting School which provides Joint Professional Military Education Level II certification in fulfillment of the requirements of the Goldwater-Nichols Act. Additionally, we graduated more than 60 students from our other master's degree programs, as well as more than 670 students from our other shorter training and certification courses, for a grand total of more than 2,000 new NDU graduates in Fiscal Year 2022.

We began our Academic Year 2022-2023 with an in-person convocation in August and classes are underway now. This year's student body for the Joint Professional Military Education Level II in-residence master's program comprises 663 students from the United States Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Air Force, Space Force, and Coast Guard; 42 agencies across the national security enterprise; 2 private sector firms; and 145 students from 75 allied and partner nations. This student body composition provides the rich diversity of perspective we seek for each of the seminars across NDU's five colleges.

We also resumed overseas travel for the first time in 2 years for our Congressionally mandated CAPSTONE course for new general and flag officers. Due to COVID-related travel and force health protection restrictions, CAPSTONE was severely curtailed in 2020 and 2021, and we are just now restoring the program to its full size, duration, and schedule. I anticipate resuming full course enrollment of 50 CAPSTONE Fellows per class beginning in 2023 for the full 5-week program which includes 2 weeks of overseas travel.

Gen (Ret.) Schwartz: Mr. President, may I ask a quick question on that? Does that include spouses?

Lt Gen Plehn: Sir, we are still working on that element, but we'll follow up and get back to you. Thank you.

COL (Ret.) Nora Marcos: And also, on that, will you be expanding where they travel? Because I believe this past class only went to UAE and Jordan.

Lt Gen Plehn: Yes, Ma'am. The current course is one week of overseas travel. It's a four-week program. We are going to go back to the full five-week program, which has a week and a half to two weeks of overseas travel, which should get two to three stops, which also usually includes the regional Combatant Command of that area.

Moving on to budgetary and other matters, during your May 2022 meeting, we provided you a long-term look at the NDU budget and discussed our current and future resourcing challenges. Following that meeting, you wrote to the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, General Milley, to recommend his support in a number of key areas, to include: investment in sustainment, restoration, and modernization of NDU facilities; investment in Information Technology infrastructure; future-year funding; ensuring that NDU continues to improve as an organization that values and supports workforce diversity; and the successful reaffirmation of accreditation. His response to your letter was favorable and we will continue to focus on, and make improvements, in all of these areas.

As I mentioned earlier, on September 30th we closed out Fiscal Year 2022. In looking at our year-end accounting, we successfully obligated 99.9 percent of our \$92.6M Operations and Maintenance budget. This was a major accomplishment by the entire team as our Resource Management Directorate worked through most of the year with only 50 percent of its authorized budget staff. As we near the end of the first month of Fiscal Year 2023, we are operating under a continuing resolution, which runs until December 16th, and which limits our spending to the same level as Fiscal Year 2022. As we await the final authorization and appropriations bills, the NDU Team is undertaking an exhaustive scrub of our Fiscal Year 2023 Spend Plan, and we have identified several areas of concern where requirements are likely to outstrip resources.

So, although we are anticipating a slightly upward funding trend over the next 5 years, it is unlikely to keep pace with increases in our personnel, facilities, operations, and other costs, which we are experiencing already. In Fiscal Year 2023, NDU expects to see an overall budget increase of approximately \$8M for Operations and Maintenance, with \$5.7M specifically approved from the Office of the Secretary of Defense for improved facilities sustainment, restoration, and modernization. However, we also anticipate an increase in civilian pay costs of more than \$9M this year due primarily to two factors: increased personnel work-year costs and our success in hiring more employees to fill our depleted faculty and staff ranks. One ongoing challenge is adequately forecasting, and then funding, our civilian pay account. Our civilian pay budget line is calculated and programmed using previous average work-year costs. For example, our Fiscal Year 2023 civilian pay funding is based on an average work-year cost of \$139,000 from Fiscal Year 2021 data compared to our actual experienced work-year cost of \$161,500 computed at the end of the recently completed Fiscal Year 2022. This work-year cost incorporates more than just the annual salary of the average employee, since it also includes funding for the employee's health plan, life insurance, retirement plan, and other personnel costs. We will work with the Joint Staff to address this issue for Fiscal Year 2024 and beyond, but this will place significant pressure on our budget this year and into the future if our authorized number of personnel billets are not funded at current or future work-year cost levels, particularly as we continue hiring for our authorized number of personnel billets.

Turning now toward our facilities, we've made solid progress in the last 6 months to address capital investment requirements in facilities and to enhance the facilities maintenance model. As you know, NDU spans three campuses and over a million square feet of real property. We partnered with the Army Corps of Engineers to understand the annual operations and maintenance requirements for the NDU infrastructure and are pursuing additional resources from the Joint Staff and the Office of the Secretary of Defense to meet this need.

Specifically, as part of our Fiscal Year 2024 budget planning, NDU submitted two funding shortfalls related to facilities and information technology to the Pentagon for consideration as they develop the overall defense budget. We requested approximately \$10M of additional funding *per year* to support facilities operations and maintenance, as well as another \$13M in procurement funding over the next 3 years to cover the development and implementation of our Enterprise Data Management Platform, as well as to finish classroom and auditorium upgrades, and improve wireless infrastructure across our campuses.

As I shared with you in our last meeting, in August 2019 my predecessor rightly closed the 140,000 square-foot Eisenhower Hall building due to water and moisture infiltration, inadequate heating and air conditioning systems, and general failure of the building envelope, all of which caused a severe mold bloom which threatened the health of those working in the building. As a result, the Eisenhower School has been displaced into Marshall and Lincoln Halls for the last 3 years, with an 80 percent reduction in space, resulting in a loss of classrooms, collaboration space and dedicated seminar and study space for students, faculty, and staff.

Excuse me for a moment.

I am very pleased to share that the Eisenhower Hall restoration and modernization project contract was awarded in September and will repair the building envelope, redesign and replace the heating and cooling system, redesign and repair crawl spaces, refurbish all interior spaces, renovate and recertify the Sensitive Compartmented Information Facility (SCIF) for classified work, and provide adequate storm water management. Construction is scheduled to begin shortly and should be completed by October 2024, followed by 90 days to test installed equipment and receive final construction approvals before occupancy in February 2025. We are extremely grateful to Congress for including \$50 million in 2022 appropriations to support facilities sustainment, restoration, and modernization for NDU and we are also very thankful to the Department of the Army for its support which has made this work possible.

Another important capital investment success is the \$3M design project for repairs to Roosevelt Hall, historic home to the National War College. This project was also awarded by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers in September of this year and is expected to take 14 months to design. Once complete, we will have an approved architectural engineering design with associated cost estimates for repairing the failing building envelope and roof, repairing masonry of the carriageway and steps, investigating and mitigating water infiltration, repairing mechanical and electrical systems, and refurbishing interior spaces. An estimated \$30M in construction funding will be pursued in FY24, but this design project will give us firm numbers to use in seeking the required resources to repair and renovate our nation's flagship war college.

Another important project we have recently completed is the new security turnstiles in Lincoln Hall. We are pursuing funding for a similar project in support of the Joint Forces Staff College facilities at our Hampton Roads campus near Norfolk and are pursuing issue papers with the Joint Staff to enable university-wide sustainment, restoration, and modernization work for all of our facilities.

In conjunction with facilities improvements, we are also making progress on NDU's Information Technology infrastructure, including the imminent completion of a multi-year \$78M investment in IT infrastructure modernization. This IT backbone modernization including replacing all network devices (e.g., firewalls, switches, and routers), will result in a substantial increase in Internet bandwidth capability from 300MB to 10GB for the fiber pipeline into and out of the University. This also included reducing on-premises enterprise hardware from 188 servers down to 27 physical devices, which reduces cybersecurity vulnerabilities and increases system reliability. We have requested an additional \$13M over the next 3 years to complete our IT modernization and build the enabling systems that will facilitate the effective delivery of our Joint Professional Military Education mission.

We are also making progress on personnel issues across the board. As you know, one of my highest priorities is improving NDU personnel end-strength and streamlining the hiring process. In Fiscal Year 2021, we completed 35 personnel hiring actions, which included 30 new personnel hires and 5 internal hires into other NDU vacancies. However, during that same time, 66 personnel departed NDU, resulting in a net loss to our workforce of 36 people that year. For this Fiscal Year that just ended, I am pleased to report that we completed 95 hiring actions, which included 88 new personnel hires and 7 internal hires into other NDU vacancies. We lost a similar number of personnel with 63 departures, however the net result was an increase of 25 new personnel to the NDU workforce. In addition to reconstituting our workforce in Fiscal Year 2022, we also reduced the time it took to hire new teammates. We decreased time-to-hire by 27 percent—to 200 days—for Title 10 faculty and staff, and reduced time-to-hire by 21 percent—to 165 days—for Title 5 staff. Those are still lengthy timeframes, so we continue to identify and implement process refinements to improve our time-to-hire rates. All of this progress is the result of a focused team effort to examine and streamline every step in the hiring process and to dedicate more time and resources in the budget to hiring faculty and staff.

One of our key leadership hires that I am happy to share with you is the selection of our new Provost. Before I do that, however, I must publicly thank Dr. Cynthia Watson who served as our Interim Provost for nearly a year, delaying her planned retirement by more than 6 months to allow us time to structure our Provost search. Dr. Watson retired in June, and in recognition of her 30-plus years of service to NDU, we conferred upon her the rank of Professor Emerita. In selecting our new Provost, we conducted a nationwide search that netted 33 applicants for the position. Our search committee conducted candidate reviews and interviews, and then recommended four finalists to me. After personally interviewing all four candidates, and after considering feedback from our faculty and staff who engaged with the four candidates, I selected Dr. James Lepse, who currently serves as Dean of Faculty and Academic Programs at the Eisenhower School, to be our new Provost. Dr. Lepse will start his new responsibilities as Provost in early December.

Other senior leader hires in 2022 included hiring chancellors for the College of Information and Cyberspace as well as the College of International Security Affairs, as well as hiring one Dean of Faculty and three Deans of Administration. Dr. Laura Junor Pulzone, who brilliantly served as Director of NDU's Institute for National Strategic Studies also recently retired. After interviewing two strong finalists for the position, I selected Dr. Denise Natali to become NDU's new INSS Director. Dr. Natali most recently served as the Director for NDU's Center for Strategic Research. We also recently welcomed Mr. Stuart Archer as the new Dean of Administration for the College of Information and Cyberspace and are in the final stages of selecting two new Deans of Faculty as well as a Chief Procurement Officer for the University.

We have also made significant progress in taking care of faculty and staff, having recently completed promotion boards for both instructional and non-instructional faculty (e.g., researchers, librarians, exercise/wargamers, and writing faculty). We also promoted 69 military and interagency faculty members who are on assignment at NDU. This required development and implementation of new policies and procedures for which I want to publicly thank Dr. Bryon Greenwald who successfully led this effort. Last year I promised our non-instructional faculty that they would finally have a promotion-board process, and Dr. Greenwald spent 12 months developing the policies and procedures to make good on that promise. Through this process we were able to recognize and reward the hard work and accomplishments of faculty across the university. We also reinstated Merit Step Increases and Quality Step Increase programs, established a more flexible telework policy, and added a semi-annual awards program.

In addition, we completed our annual Talent Management Review Board, which resulted in performance awards for faculty and staff, and selective extensions to Title 10 term appointments, which are now aligned to a standard renewal cycle with all eligible employees considered at one board and timed to provide notification at least one year before expiration of their current appointment. On the subject of performance management, and at the request of our Commandants and Chancellors, I have adjusted the rating scheme for our most senior leaders. Moving forward, the NDU President now serves as rater and senior rater for NDU's College Commandants and Chancellors.

While we have made progress improving our university and developing our team, future excellence requires that we continue to strive for additional data-informed improvements. An important way we access valuable insights is through participation in the annual Defense Equal Opportunity Management Institute's Organizational Climate Survey, commonly referred to as DEOCS. This anonymous survey focuses on organizational effectiveness, equal opportunity, and sexual assault response and prevention, and provides University and component leadership with vital insights into the health of our organization. Another tool we use is the annual Federal Employee Viewpoint Survey (FEVS), which is administered by the Office of Personnel Management. This survey provides another anonymous way for employees to share their candid views of working at NDU. I personally encourage every faculty and staff member to participate in these surveys so we can have a well-informed understanding of the climate, culture, and

working environment at NDU. The entire leadership team and I take this seriously; last year's DEOCS generated 135 pages of written responses and I read every single word. We recently completed this year's FEVS and the next iteration of DEOCS launched on October 14 and will close on the 4th of November. **I have promised our team that I will once again read every single word of their survey responses with a commitment to understanding and addressing our most pressing and prevalent issues.**

As I close this State of the University address, I would like to thank you again for your commitment to helping us improve the National Defense University. Your support and insight have been very helpful in guiding and informing the direction of this University, as well as providing candid feedback to the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and to me. Looking forward over the next year, I ask for your continued insights and assistance on priorities we've already discussed: hiring, facilities, funding, and accreditation reaffirmation. I also ask your support as we open the aperture to include additional areas of focus, such as: completion and implementation of the new NDU strategic plan; examination of our curricula and delivery methods to ensure we are adapting to changes in the national security environment to best meet stakeholder needs (e.g., exercises and wargaming); and engagement with our most strategically important stakeholders, to include Combatant Commands and the U.S. Congress. Some of our Board members have already provided insight and suggestions into our Congressional Engagement Approach, and that has been extremely helpful to us.

With that in mind, the University team and I are looking forward to presenting you with an update today on our team efforts to improve NDU, and we look forward to your questions and insights throughout the day. We also look forward to your recommendations for the Spring 2023 meeting of the NDU Board of Visitors, which—with your concurrence—we are planning to host at the Joint Forces Staff College in Hampton Roads, Virginia.

In closing, we would be pleased to have you join us this evening at NDU's National Hall of Fame induction ceremony in which we will honor three of our most distinguished alumni: General Lloyd Newton, Brigadier General Wilma Vaught, and Ambassador Wanda Nesbitt.

Again, thank you for your support for the National Defense University, and I would be happy to take your questions.

Gen (Ret.) Schwartz: Mr. President thank you very much for that comprehensive overview. I have one question and one editorial comment, and then I am sure there will be others from members of the Board of Visitors. Can you give us a sense of your adequacy of SCIF facilities at Fort McNair for educational purposes and for that matter, for discrete meeting purposes.

Lt Gen Plehn: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I would say they're inadequate. We have 3 SCIF spaces here aboard the North campus in Fort McNair. I would say down at Joint Forces Staff College the SCIF spaces are actually far better aligned to their mission than we are up here at the Fort McNair campus. One of those SCIF spaces is occupied for at least one quarter of the year solely to accommodate the CAPSTONE Fellows throughout their courses, since that's the level at which those are taught. But for day-to-day activity, we do not have a tremendous amount of classified content in our various curricula, partly to make sure that we're accommodating those 145 international fellows and having a robust discussion amongst them. But I would say that certainly is an area that we—we could use more SCIF space, Sir. Thank you.

Gen (Ret.) Schwartz: Something to perhaps to consider in planning. And my editorial comment is perhaps to be sensitive to the potential for survey fatigue.

Lt Gen Plehn: Yes, Sir.

Gen (Ret.) Schwartz: Are there any questions?

AMB Bismarck Myrick: Mr. President, I just have one query. Is there any anticipation of changing the number of allied and partner country students in your programs?

Lt Gen Plehn: Thank you, Mr. Ambassador. The short answer is yes, and we've been on that upward trajectory for several years now. Under the previous administration, dating back about two, two plus years, the Secretary of Defense had issued a call to increase the number of international fellows in professional military education by 50 percent. So that's what has occasioned our upward ramp in those number of fellows. What I would tell you is that was an unfunded mandate. So, we are starting to bump up against the upper limit of what we can accommodate without additional resources—particularly because our student to faculty ratio at our five colleges is determined or dictated by the Joint Staff in regulation. So, as we increase the number of international fellows, we also have to increase the number of faculty and staff that go along with that.

What I would tell you, some really great work's going on by Barbara Gilchrist our Chief Financial Officer and our Resource Management Division as part of that fiscal year 23 spend plan deep dive we're doing. And part of that discussion is to examine the reimbursable cost model across all areas, and one of those areas of course deals with the international fellows, many of whom are paid through international military education and training funds, which flow through the State Department budget as you know, Sir. So, I think there's great opportunity here for us to dive deeply into that with the primary stakeholders and then go have a discussion with the State Department, which then potentially could lead to a discussion with our other stakeholders at the Combatant Command level and Congress about what it would take to continue to increase the number of international fellows here.

Gen (Ret.) Schwartz: Ambassador Roemer.

AMB Timothy Roemer: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. General Plehn, extremely helpful presentation and very comprehensive. I have several, I hope, just short questions. First of all, for the response from General Milley to the letter that Chairman Schwartz and the Board put together with a lot of thought—we wrote them in June and received the response in September. I quote from General Milley, "My staff and I will work with the Department Services and NDU to identify and implement durable solutions and provide sufficient facility resourcing and directive authority for its use to NDU." I thought that was a very positive response. He went on to say, "I look forward to your continued reporting on infrastructure concerns." He talked about the reaffirmation of the accreditation process and the emphasis that we put in the letter on diversity at NDU and recruiting diversity; and finally, he mentioned the NDU Next. And what's your thoughts on that? To what degree have you been able to follow up on any of this to indicate to General Milley's staff that this is a good response, but you're interested in following through and implementing this?

Lt Gen Plehn: Thank you, Ambassador Roemer. We are in close contact with the Joint Staff J7, which has the policy responsibility and oversight for all Professional Military Education, to include Joint Professional Military Education here at NDU. We worked carefully with them on the Chairman's response. What I would tell you is some of these things are already underway and some of them are developmental, that we've got much more work to do. So, areas where we have more work to do include the mechanism for sustainable, durable solutions for facilities sustainment, restoration, and modernization here at NDU. As I mentioned to you in your last meeting, those funds flow through Service channels for whichever Service owns the installation that our campuses are on, and then our requirements have to compete with their Service requirements. And often, we don't get a very strong voice in that. So that's

one avenue that we intend to highlight with the Chairman and the Joint Staff and have that discussion with the individual Services to try to develop that durable solution.

In terms of recruiting diversity, we have not made as much progress on that as I would like to, so that is going to rise up in the priority level. But again, this is primarily a Service issue that we will have to work with them because they're the ones who choose the individuals who come to work here. And when I say Service, I also mean the interagency, and I also mean the international community as well. We set some baseline requirements of what it takes to be eligible to attend NDU, but we are not involved in the selection process, over.

AMB Roemer: On the Eisenhower building that you mentioned, \$50 million was received from the United States Congress for that. You begin construction within a month. A recommendation I would make would be to invite members of Congress to the groundbreaking to thank them, but also to begin to tee up what you will probably have as a \$30 million request in 2024 for the Roosevelt construction or reconstruction/rehab. I think that's good news. Are you pleased with the progress on these facilities then? Is there more that you want for technology upgrades and other things? How would you outline the next couple of years of requests to Congress?

Lt Gen Plehn: Thank you, Ambassador Roemer. I really like the idea of celebrating the groundbreaking work to repair Eisenhower Hall and finally reopen it. Because, by the time that construction is done two years hence, it will have been five years since that building had last been occupied. So, I think that's worth celebrating, getting the work started. I think it's also worth celebrating when the work completes. And right now, that's projected in October 2024, which by the way is the 100-year anniversary of the establishment of the forerunner to the Eisenhower School, which was the Army Industrial College in 1924. So, I think there are some elegant ways to bookend both the beginning of the construction and the end of it.

What I am pleased with is the progress we have made in making known the requirements for the condition of our facilities at all of our campuses. And then, it has been kind of a stepwise process to make people understand what that requirement is and how they can help with it. The primary piece that we've been focused on for the last year is just the physical structure of buildings that are failed or failing. And your question then takes us inside of the building, once we've established that as a healthy building for the next 20 to 25 years. Are the classrooms and the other facilities at a sufficient level that would really indicate a world-class learning environment? I think there's much more we can do in those areas, and wargaming certainly is one of those areas that we would like to bring more strongly to the National Defense University.

AMB Roemer: Just by editorial comment, and I will close, I would encourage you to continue your very thoughtful, and I think helpful, long-term approach to improving Congressional relations that meet your goals to get money for hiring and facilities. Funding is everything for improving NDU, and the Congressional relations outreach is a key component to that. Whether you need to put more time and personnel and resources into staffing that up over time is something you should also think about. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Gen (Ret.) Schwartz: Dr. Howard from Zoom land.

Dr. Christopher Howard: Thank you very much, General. Can you hear me okay?

Lt Gen Plehn: Yes, Sir. Loud and clear, Dr. Howard.

Dr. Howard: Thank you. So excellent presentation and congratulations on the progress you've made; there's work to be done as my colleagues have pointed out. I have two questions, one having to do with the Eisenhower building. Is there an opportunity or have in the plans and design will it be LEED certified? Thinking about, you know, environmental, not clean tech, but will it be LEED certified using cutting-edge sort of renewable energy, etc., etc.? There's an opportunity to demonstrate what I think the Armed Forces are trying to do is be mindful of the climate, mindful of those sorts of things that impact the space we live in, we all share. That would be number one. Number two, any specifics, General Plehn, on how you accelerated your hiring time, when people applied to when they were hired? I know it's not where you want it to be, but it's better net-net than what it was before. Any specific learnings that improved that time to hire? Over.

Lt Gen Plehn: Thank you, Dr. Howard. I'm going to say that the building will not be up to LEED standards, but I am looking at our Chief Operating Officer. That was not part of the design requirements when the original design was let. And I'm also looking at our Director of Facilities, and she's giving me the same answer that, no, it will not be brought up to LEED standards. The building is more than 60 years old. It was opened in 1960. One of the primary problems that resulted in the building having to be closed was the fact that there was no vapor barrier on the interior of the exterior wall. This repair project will fix that issue and will also fix some of the heating, ventilation, and air conditioning issues that led to poor air flow that also led to moisture and then an environment that was conducive to the mold bloom as well. While we would certainly like to be able to move up to that standard, that was not part of the design there. I do not believe it is part of the design for Roosevelt Hall either—over a 100-year-old building, cornerstone laid by Teddy Roosevelt in the early 1900s. Again, what we're trying to do with that building is get a design that helps us preserve the structure of it, so it avoids the same set of problems that led to the closure of Eisenhower's home.

On your second question with time to hire, there are a lot of hands in the success that we have achieved over the last 12 months with increasing the number of teammates we've brought on board at NDU, as well as the speed with which we have brought them on board. Certainly, Mr. John Freeman, our Chief of Human Capital, leading his team and Human Resources has had a huge role to play here along with Ms. Kolbe, our Chief Operating Officer. But hiring is a team sport at NDU, because the individual selections generally are done within the College or Component. So, the Component will make their vacancy and their requirement known to the University; we'll put it through the human capital system. But then once we get the advertisement out there and people apply for it, the selection process really is done at that Component or College level. Last year, actually, I think it was late fiscal year 21, Ms. Kolbe came to me and said I think we need to have some outside help to look at our University and our University processes. We contracted with McKinsey and Company to do an organizational diagnostic of the entire National Defense University. And they came up with a number of different areas in which they said if you improve in these areas, you will be a rising tide that will lift many things there. If I could just turn to Ms. Kolbe and see if she would care to offer any thoughts on the time to hire piece.

Ms. Kathryn Kolbe: Thank you, Sir. I would agree with you. It's a combination of getting more hiring specialists into our HR Directorate, but also really setting hiring targets for each part of the hiring process, which we didn't have previously. We're going to continue to drive those timelines down. And we're also creating an end-to-end data repository so that we can track as to how HR, to help all of the Colleges be able to track, how they're doing. We don't have that right now, so we're building that. And that's going to be a huge advantage to us to be able to check on the status of all hiring actions in one transparent place for everyone to use at any time and to have access to it. And then, to track how we're doing and improve as we go.

Dr. Howard: Thank you.

Gen (Ret.) Schwartz: We'll take two more questions and then move to the to the next module. Dr. Patil, you have a question, Sir.

Dr. DJ Patil: Yes, but it is more framed as a couple comments to posit out there. One is on the infrastructure challenges of the information technology (IT) with respect to the routers and fiber, etc. I think one of the of the parts I would encourage you to explore is all of these likely fall under a cybersecurity rubric for upgrades as well. The SCIF, I think, is a really good call out that was made earlier for what it is those upgrades need to look like. As we think about that infrastructure, the part that I would put in there is to not just think about it as a one-time expense, but to know that some percent of that is regularly revolving so that we don't find where we're in this situation five years from now.

The second comment on the time to hire and the other thread that has been brought up throughout this conversation is to recognize that great talent doesn't know, oftentimes, that it needs to be at NDU—or at the place wherever they're needed most and are likely to have the greatest impact. I thank you for the call out to Secretary Carter early today. I think about the job that Secretary Carter did in recruiting so aggressively across the multitude of things that he worked on. And I think one of the things that made him extra special was his creativity in saying, hey, this person could be helpful here and the personal hand he did in recruiting those people rather than just handing it off to a classic recruiter. So, I would just encourage all of us to think of recruiting as a team sport, as was stated earlier. And all of us, everybody in the NDU family and the broader NDU family, have a responsibility to that. What are mechanisms that can be done to alert people about the opportunities for talent so that we can collectively use our networks to find good talent to support the mission?

Lt Gen Plehn: Mr. Chair, if I may. Thank you, Dr. Patil. What I would note in terms of your first comment on IT infrastructure is absolutely that needs to be built into our program every single year; that's a recurring cost. As we said here today, that consumes about \$0.20 on the dollar for every dollar NDU gets, and a lot of it is contracted service support at this point versus life cycle upgrade. The life cycle upgrade tends to be an additional requirement that we lay out there—as I mentioned, that \$13 million that we are seeking over the next three years to do some of that.

Second point, on time to hire, and it does leak into your third point, how do we make NDU an attractive proposition for really talented people to want to come here and spend their time, talent, and energy with us? There is a very real limitation that deals with compensation. The most senior personnel at NDU are limited by level three of the Federal Executive Schedule in terms of their pay. We're looking at how do we at least try to bump that up one more level so that it can be at level two of the Federal Executive Schedule, which is about another \$15,000 to \$18,000 per year, but that's still on the fairly low end of the scale for a large-scale university to attract world class talent. So, the world class talent we do have here is because they are personally invested in what we do. There are many who are foregoing much richer compensation that they could get elsewhere just to continue to serve here at the National Defense University. At the risk of getting too public about it, what I would note is the Department of Defense can hire retired military personnel with no offset to that person's retired pay. It's not the same for the other agencies of the federal government. If we hire another federal annuitant, their retired pay gets offset by their NDU salary, to the point where they may only make \$10,000 or \$15,000 a year more than what their retired pay would have been. And yet, there are some who choose to come here at that great personal cost. There may be room there for additional discussions on compensation.

Finally, to your point on recruiting, you will hear a little bit more later in the day on some initiatives that Dr. Greenwald and the rest of the team have implemented to get the word out more widely about NDU as an opportunity. Thank you.

Gen (Ret.) Schwartz: Final question from Admiral Breckenridge, please.

VADM Jody Breckenridge: Good morning and thank you for that brief, Sir. As I mentioned last night, I'm very excited about hearing wargaming; you're looking at wargaming coming back. I think that's a critical part of the training here to really solidify what you have spent all the time in the classroom and through the seminar process, so I look forward to hearing more comments on how that evolves and how we might help you. With respect to diversity, I just wanted to offer that I think there may be an additional opportunity. Congress seems to be very interested in this, in the JPME training perspective. There's current language and there is language in the current version of the NDAA that is going to ask for a report looking at JPME training—praising DoD and the system for the diversity of thought and perspective brought in but asking some more general questions. And so, I think there will be an opportunity to elevate that looking at the student populations, and also looking if you need new authorities or new collaborations to look at hiring processes in addition to what you've already done. Lastly, I did not hear anything in the brief and have a question on (other than the number of industry reps that we have) sort of rethinking portions of our curricula on how we might engage industry and have a more regular sustainable presence of industry within our JPME training systems here at NDU. Thank you.

Lt Gen Plehn: Thank you, Admiral Breckinridge. On wargaming, we do have our Acting Director of the Center for Applied Strategic Learning in the room, Mr. Ken Kligge. We do have a short module later this morning to talk about that, so please do grill them—I know that Ken is ready for it, as well as Dr. Greenwald. ***audience laughter***

Thank you for highlighting the potential language in the NDAA. We'll go sifting through that and have a look at that. Finally on industry, we've been fairly active over the last year engaging with BENS, the Business Executives for National Security, NDIA, the National Defense Industrial Association, AIA, and a number of others, as well as the NDU Foundation reaching out to their industry contacts, just to make sure, first of all, they're aware of what NDU is, aware that there's an opportunity for Private Sector Fellows to come here to NDU. But then, we also review the curriculum, particularly in the Eisenhower School. We've added one additional industry study this year and refocused some of the other existing ones, so we have 19 different industry study areas in the Eisenhower School. My goal—we can talk about this in the goal setting section—is within the next one to two years to have a Private Sector Industry Fellow in each one of those 19 different industry studies.

Gen (Ret.) Schwartz: President Plehn, thank you again for a great overview, and I think it is now time to move to John Yaeger's presentation.

Lt Gen Plehn: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

**0955-1020 Update on Reaffirmation of Middle States Commission on Higher Education
Accreditation: Self-Study Recommendations for Improvement
Dr. John Yaeger and Mr. Robert Orr III, MSCHE Steering Committee Co- Chairs**

Dr. John Yaeger:

Good morning again. Dean Jamie Orr and I serve as the self-study co-chairs during the self-study process.

<Slide 3>

As a reminder, the law requires NDU to provide a rigorous education yet does not define rigor. We use accreditation to ensure we comply with the law.

<Slide 4>

There are many definitions of accreditation. It not only demonstrates that we are rigorous, but Middle States accreditation has a theme of constantly improving, and we use the self-study process to do that. In a few minutes, Jaime and I will go through the working groups' findings for each standard.

<Slide 5>

The top shows the overall timeline, and beneath it is the detailed timeline. We provided the Evaluation Chair, who will visit us in March, an early draft of the self-study. The Chair visited the university to plan the March visit, and he provided feedback on the self-study. We owe the final self-study to the Evaluation Team six weeks prior to the visit. The self-study leadership has set the goal of 31 January 2023 to have the report complete. One important note regarding the final self-study, it's supposed to be a critical analysis. Therefore, Middle States discourages institutions from publishing it or posting it to show how great they are (or we are). They also don't want us to necessarily share it with other institutions, as a concern that they will then use it as a checklist instead of going through their own journey of critical analysis.

<Slide 6>

We had five intended outcomes of the self-study, and this morning, we want to focus on the second outcome. During the self-study, we not only wanted to show that we met the standards, we also wanted to identify these areas of improvement. A couple of caveats, Jaime and I did not edit these. We are showing you every one of the suggestions. They had the freedom to say what they thought and felt. Jaime and I have purposely left every suggestion on the slides. They're unconstrained by resources at this point. It is hoped that these ideas will be fleshed out through a process, and those ideas that make it through the part of the process, will probably become a part of the strategic plan. And those that we have completed before we submit the final self-study will be shown as this document is completed.

<Slide 7>

These are the seven standards. Each working group had a representative from across the university. These were fairly large working groups that included faculty, staff, military and civilians. Now *Standard III* is the *Student Experience*, and we use the students that participate in standard three from the class of 2022, so that we got their input.

<Slide 8>

Now we'll go ahead into the standards. *Standard I* is on *Mission and Goals*. Since undergoing the last accreditation, we've had three strategic plans. Each was developed differently, and one, the second one, was developed by a few individuals and was not an inclusive process. We would benefit from a policy, probably developed by incorporating best practices of other institutions, that lays out a process for us to follow as we develop a strategic plan. Also, the NDU community would benefit from information on how the plan is going. In order for it to be a living document, we've really got to have a communication strategy with this. And by the way, we've actually got the communication strategy done— we're working on finalizing the strategic plan so we can implement the communication strategy.

Mr. Jaime Orr:

<Slide 9>

Under *Standard II, Ethics and Integrity*. The university, of the recommendations it included, promulgated a university-wide policy for rating and grade appeals. We do have a uniform policy on grades. We do not have a single uniform policy on grade appeals. Instead, there are different policies within each college that are similar but have different timelines. The fact that these policies exist means we do meet the standard, even though they're slightly different timelines and some specifics [vary] for each of the colleges.

On ethics, we did used to have an active ethics center that included the Colin Powell Ethics Chair that was funded by the NDU Foundation. When we had that center, Gen (Ret.) Dick Myers, US Air Force, was the chair, and he taught an elective and was frequently seen around and involved in the university. We had a civilian SES and two military officers assigned to that center who also taught electives on ethics. When Gen (Ret.) Myers left to become president of KSU, college faculty turned less frequently to the center for advice, guidance, and insight into ethics curriculum. The phone in that center stopped ringing. It was also the case that the two military faculty assigned to the center were needed elsewhere, teaching core courses in the colleges as opposed to only teaching and focusing on ethics electives to a dozen or more students at a time. Since then, we have been able to increase the faculty at colleges and discussion is underway on how best to restart a university-wide ethics program, currently being undertaken by the Deputy Provost and a small group of college faculty. Ethics as part of the institutional learning outcomes does make great sense, and while we've determined that the subject is included in each of the college-level program outcomes, the university institutional outcomes will be revised this year to specifically highlight consideration of ethics in the curriculum.

Dr. Yaeger:

<Slide 10>

These first couple of bullets speak for themselves. We have not had a university catalog that describes all of our academic programs, major policies, and opportunities for students across the university. We have one now, thanks to Kelly Hart, who is also the chair of the Staff Advisory Council. And on the final bullet, COVID forced us to become more innovative, and the working group looking at this standard encouraged us to keep the momentum going and keep up the innovation.

Mr. Jaimie Orr:

<Slide 11>

We have learned a great deal through our COVID experience. We do need to continue to learn and take greater advantage, especially of the tools within the Microsoft 365 web and community-based platforms. And we're working on those.

We've also always struggled with how to keep our alumni engaged. Our alumni are our most important resource in keeping the curriculum current. What are the problems they are dealing with today in their professions? What did we teach them that helps them in these positions? And perhaps even more importantly, what did we teach them that they do not use? Or what did we fail to teach? We'd like to continue to leverage technology so that their 10-month experience turns into a 10 year and more experience.

Gen (Ret.) Norton Schwartz: LTG Hooper?

LTG (Ret.) Charles Hooper: Thank you very much, General Hooper here. Before we go any further, I know we're going to cover a number of issues, but I wanted to comment on this issue of an ethics

curriculum. I would argue that our recent historical developments have placed quite a bit of emphasis on the development and the sustainment of ethics as a part of officer education. And far from a consideration, I would recommend that this become a priority, to not only reestablish but to grow this ethics curriculum. I would further recommend that NDU consider becoming the central center within the Department of Defense for the teaching of ethics in our Officer Corps, particularly focusing on our rising senior officers.

Gen (Ret.) Schwartz: And if I may amplify, I agree completely. I also think as part of the ethics curriculum there needs to be education related to avoiding domestic politics.

LTG (Ret.) Hooper: Yes.

Gen (Ret.) Schwartz: Lt Gen Plehn?

Lt Gen Michael Plehn: Thank you, General Schwartz, and thank you LTG Hooper. A couple of points about this in support and agreement of what you all have said. Our current Colin Powell Chair of Ethics is General (Ret.) Peter Pace, who comes here frequently and is fantastic, quite frankly. We are currently revising and reviewing the ethics curriculum. Somehow, it was going to disappear for this academic year, and once the senior leadership became aware of it, we went “well, that's not a good idea.” Under the leadership of the Deputy Provost and others, we do intend to restart that in the spring semester, and we do have one specific faculty member who is dedicated to that as well. But it definitely is a growth area, and it will have to then be slotted in with the rest of the requirements. What you're seeing in several different areas is the resultant of multiple years of cuts to faculty and staff inside of NDU, which again, is why we're so focused on kind of reconstituting the faculty and staff. And that discussion, on being able to fully fund all authorized billets, becomes really salient at that point, over.

AMB Roemer: One quick follow up question, General. Where precisely does the funding come for this? Is it the Foundation? The University? A combination? Does that have a big impact on the continuation and the robustness of this?

Lt Gen Plehn: I'll turn to our Deputy Provost in just a second. Salaries for the actual faculty come through our operations and maintenance budget. The Foundation supports the chair, the ethics chair, meaning General (Ret.) Pace, who is doing this pro bono, quite frankly. Mr. Chair, our Deputy Provost, has a comment as well.

Dr. Bryon Greenwald: Yes Sir, Bryon Greenwald here, for those who are on camera. We are committed to growing the ethics program beyond “let's give it to the chaplain and the lawyer,” and making it part of everybody's curriculum so that we have communities of interest at each college and communities of interest across the university. And we have key tenants that we all want to talk about, not just behaving ethically, morally, legally as senior officers and senior civilians, but also then this issue of civilian-military relations and how do we stay on the correct side of the line while doing your job. Thank you.

LTG (Ret.) Hooper: I would just add a last quick comment. I would argue that current events are screaming out for a center of excellence on this topic, and I'm not trying to add rocks to your rucksack here General Plehn, but certainly in discussions, I would consider that somebody should take responsibility for this.

Gen (Ret.) Schwartz: I would argue that's not a rock. I think Dr. Patil has a comment please.

Dr. DJ Patil: Yes, thank you. Easy things to say, hard things to implement. In the bucket of this curriculum, which I absolutely think is essential, I would just encourage thinking about this also from a

technology perspective. We're seeing an unbelievable amount of energy and conversation go into ethics around the use of technology, specifically AI and AI trust systems, as is highlighted by misuse comments in the DDR&E strategy. And there's a lot of upcoming aspects around how is data used? How do we think about these different systems that fall into ethics in a way that are really at the beginning, as we see a technology transformation with the use of data, machine learning, AI systems and other aspects as well? And I would not make that the primary, but it is something that I believe is needed in the curriculum and we are seeing that happen across curriculums across the country now.

Dr. Yaeger: Thank you, that's great input. I do know these minutes will become part of our documented evidence in the final self-study that shows we are trying to improve. One clarification on the resources that Dr. Greenwald mentioned, the chaplain and the lawyer. These are folks here, as part of the resources sent here from the chaplains and the JAG Corps to help us with ethics. And we want to make sure we do this at their use and that we're taking advantage of what they have to offer.

COL (Ret.) Nora Marcos: No, I think what he meant is what we're used to is that we have someone else worry about it. Not that they're not the right people, they're absolutely the right people, but it can't be an afterthought. I think a lot of us understood.

Dr. Yaeger: Yes, and putting this together in the curriculum, the Services have given us dedicated folks.

Gen (Ret.) Schwartz: And having exemplars like Ash Carter or General (Ret.) Pace or others are important on this as well. That not only do we think about this in an academic sense, but we think about this and observe people who have lived it effectively.

VADM (Ret.) Breckenridge: And one last comment I would add to that, that I would hope to the concept that's been presented by General Hooper of being the center of excellence, that there would be outreach to the leadership chairs at the academies to share this and what we're doing here. And of course, they have additional linkages so that we're creating the network and that you truly not only have it as part of the curriculum, but *are* the center of excellence.

Dr. Yaeger: That's great. Excellent input.

Gen (Ret.) Schwartz: Back to you, John.

Dr. Yaeger:

<Slide 12>

On this standard, although civilians' higher education shifted to outcomes-based quite a time ago, it's fairly new in joint professional military education (JPME). The goal is to have every lesson tied to program learning outcomes, which tie to outcomes across the university. And the sauce to success is something called a rubric. And we've put in your folder an example of one because they're hard to understand. This is where assessments or grades are broken down so the professor and the student know where they may improve. The NDU experience is about leader development and the way you develop leaders is through critical feedback, not just here's your B+ and move on. We also want to expose students to multiple perspectives, so in the classroom there's emphasis on students contributing to the learning. It's not participation; it's the contribution.

There are many nuances to developing these rubrics, and if you're participating in the development of them, you understand them better, just like in the curriculum. If you help develop it, you understand it better. The working group felt we really need to invest more in this area.

Regarding equitable resources, I think it's always a challenge to manage this perception with the branch campuses across higher education. It'll be worth looking into.

With regard to the promotion—the perception of inequities in promotion and hiring—as the NDU-P said, as soon as this came up he's been working on it. We really have instituted a policy for non-instructional faculty promotion. This input was provided before that was implemented, but the university policy on hiring, titling, and promotion has been significantly revised. Finally, as said by the NDU-P, also significant amount of progress has been made in streamlining and oversight of hiring processes.

For the final bullet of collecting, maintaining, analyzing and archiving faculty and staff demographic data. The demographics the working group was referring to included the Services, agency, and their backgrounds. The lack of capability showed up in a couple of standards and the idea is to ensure all perspectives are represented. In another standard, which I'll get to soon, there is concern about whether military staff and faculty have enough of a voice.

Gen (Ret.) Schwartz: Ambassador Myrick?

AMB Myrick: Oh yes, thank you. I just have a broad question. I'm thinking that the Middle States Commission process evaluates other than PME institutions, and I'm just curious to know about the standards, and if there are accommodations made for the PME process? And then secondly, are there strategies that NDU is able to draw on, that have been used successfully at the non-PME institutions, including how we deal with the issues such as ethics and other processes?

Dr. Yaeger: The first question, Sir, we are unique. And so, what Middle States found, and particularly in *Standard VII* which is *Governance*, because most universities have a board of governors that chooses the university president or CEO, they [Middle States] have determined that it's best to have the Evaluation Team Chair from a like institution. For example, I chaired the visits to National Intelligence University and I chaired the visit to the Army War College, and the Army War College chair will come to understand these nuances because of that. The standards are the same. At religious institutions, it's the same thing. They've got governance differences, so they've got people doing that. As far as looking at other institutions—that, yes, we really do try and do that as much as we can.

You mentioned ethics, they're probably dealing with just warfare theory. I mean other colleges and universities do teach that, so I'm sure we will look at that and we do look at those.

Mr. Orr: Sir, I'm part of the working group that's working with the Deputy Provost on this. I do know that the military faculty who've been doing this before have, in fact, visited the academies and at least one other JPME institution to see how they run their program. And they're bringing that guidance back to our working group as we reconstitute the center here.

Gen (Ret.) Schwartz: One last comment before we move on to the next standard. For the next meeting of the Board of Visitors, I think we should put on the agenda the status of the Fort Bragg institution. We can take that on at a later date. Thank you.

Mr. Orr:

<Slide 13>

For *Standard VI*, the working group came up with three broad categories of recommendations that will fit nicely into the new strategic plan:

- improve our organizational health
- establish systems to support data-based decision making
- become a learning organization.

NDU is currently pursuing the improvement of organizational health through the initiatives that have already been identified and initiatives that have been identified in assessments over the last year. We're also focused on establishing data and knowledge management systems to support data-based decision-making and focusing on becoming a learning organization with systems thinking.

Dr. Yaeger:

<Slide 14>

Standard VII is Governance. And this top bullet highlights an opportunity for improvement with you, the Board of Visitors, regarding two aspects. One is assessing the performance of the university president, which is now required by Middle States. General Schwartz has in fact taken this on board. However, you know, previous university presidents have wanted nothing to do with this requirement, and this is a pitfall. This is a pitfall of having between eight and ten years between accreditation visits. The self-study group recommends that we develop an enduring process and not make it just for the presidents that are here during reaffirmation. The second area is the recommendation to have the Board set goals and assess themselves against those goals. Perhaps we could have an administrative session, not a public meeting, where the Board could discuss this.

We'll hear more about TRESA, the model, a little later, well, right after this in fact. And hopefully this suggestion will make more sense after that discussion.

The final bullet gets to something I alluded to earlier. Do the military officers and enlisted have appropriate roles, across the university, where their voices are heard? When I came here many years ago, the provost, the chief operating officer, the college academic deans, the college deans of admin—those were all military billets that have since been civilianized. It would probably be healthy to just take a look and see if we're making the best use of these resources.

That concludes our presentation. I really thank you for your thoughtful input. Ready for any further questions or comment.

[no comments]

Gen (Ret.) Schwartz: OK, let's move on.

1020-1100 Performance Management: Senior Leaders
Lieutenant General Michael T. Plehn, NDU President

Lt Gen Plehn:

Well, good morning once again, ladies and gentlemen. Mike Plehn here. The Board and the Board Chair requested a discussion on performance management, specifically for senior leaders. So that's what this next time block is designed to do, is to provide the opportunity to do that. We also will have an opportunity to discuss performance management a little deeper inside of the University, just to let you know how we do that.

On the senior leaders' side of the house, I've already mentioned that we're going to change the reporting structure such that all of the Commandants and Chancellors are rated and senior rated by me. Part of the impetus of that came because of the military rating system that required me to be in the rating chain for some of the military officers. And so, in the interest of fairness and equity across the board, if I'm going to rate some of them, I should rate all of them. That came through clearly from all of them, and I think that's something that, at least right now, all are looking forward to.

I also am the rater for our Chief Operating Officer, for our Provost, and for a number of other senior leaders inside of the organization. Being the US government, there are, of course, forms, standardized forms, by which we do the initial discussion of what your roles and responsibilities are in your particular job, and then we do midpoint feedback. We do a final appraisal at the end of the rating cycle, which usually is at the end of June, and then we prepare for the next year and move on from that.

One of the primary questions, and it relates to what Dr. John Yaeger was just talking about under Standard VII of Governance, is who rates the NDU President? It is a requirement under Middle States Commission on Higher Education that the Board evaluate the performance of the President of the University. So, to that end, several months ago General Schwartz and Dr. Yaeger had a conversation, and General Schwartz said here is a template that I have used (that he has used) in the past that is helpful for having that kind of discussion.

<Slide - Template>

If we do have that available, what I offer for your consideration, ladies and gentlemen, this template. There is another version of this that is the 2022 performance goals, but we're just about done with 2022. While I filled that out—and General Schwartz and I will have a conversation about that, and he will provide me feedback—I thought it would also be useful to look into 2023 and list out what I see as some of the goals for the University President to achieve on behalf of the University.

What you see is the first section, and this is a work in progress, ladies and gentlemen. Mr. Chair, would love to have a conversation about all of the content that is in here. We've populated the first section there just with the NDU Board of Visitors (your) approved strategic goals for the National Defense University. Then if you Scroll down, you will see individual objectives. What I chose to do was to align those objectives with our three lines of effort here at National Defense University.

The first of those lines of effort is "Enable Student, Alumni and Stakeholder Success." That is so broad that you have to have some subobjectives that get you down to achievable things you can measure whether or not we got those done. One of those is "Continue our transition to Outcomes Based Military Education (OBME)." The Joint Staff has laid out a series of milestones that you have to achieve in route to OBME.

I'm pleased to report that all five of our Colleges plus Capstone have now achieved Milestone 1 accreditation, and we're on the path towards Milestone 2. This is a very soft goal right now, "Progress towards Milestone 2." I think we need to do some work to refine that—say what does that mean for calendar year 2023 in terms of achievable things that I can give to the Commandants and Chancellors, and to their Deans of Faculty, and to the Provost and Deputy Provost to progress towards Milestone 2 in OBME?

Next, "Determine Stakeholder Requirements." This was a discussion at your last meeting back in May. How do you know you're teaching the right things? How is that being received by the stakeholders who employ our graduates? In the Joint Staff Regulation, there is a separate regulation for implementation of OBME, and the last 10 or 20 pages is kind of a laundry list of survey tools, but they're focused primarily on the individual graduate as opposed to surveying the stakeholders.

I think one of the goals for 2023 for me, on behalf of the University to work with the Joint Staff, particularly with the military stakeholders, is to determine who else needs to be surveyed and how we do that? Because this is an enterprise-wide requirement, this is more than just an NDU requirement. Then once we set the groundwork for that, there is a new Joint Staff J7, who was recently appointed, Lieutenant General Dagvin Anderson, full of energy and really picking up from where Admiral Munsch left off and continuing to propel us in the future. So, we'll set this as one of the discussion items with the Joint Staff J7, and I think it would make an excellent topic for the Military Education Coordination Council, which meets at least once a year. Once we get that settled, how do we conduct those surveys and then get the feedback from them?

And then finally, "Accreditation Reaffirmation." As you heard Dr. Yaeger say, we intend to submit our finalized self-study to Middle States Commission on Higher Education Evaluation Team by the 31st of January, and then we will host the Evaluation Team in the March timeframe. Let me pause there just for a second and see if that engenders any conversation, Mr. Chair.

Gen (Ret.) Schwartz: Let me say that my hope on this was to develop a level of consensus amongst us that these are the correct goals for the President of the University, and then in subsequent opportunities, we'll assess achievement of those goals and rate accordingly.

Lt Gen Plehn: Thank you. Moving on to Objective 2, which is aligned with Line of Effort 2, "Improve our University." You can "drive a truck" through that, and that's intentionally so that we can hang on to that line of effort everything that really falls in the realm of improving our university, and there's a lot there. "Facilities," and you can read the subobjectives under there. That last one, "Establish flagship agreement with," or last two "with Headquarters Army" and "Headquarters Navy," I think, is a possible way to implement what was in the Chairman's response to you that Ambassador Roemer highlighted earlier. If we get an agreement with the Army and the Navy to consider our joint requirements, if not separately at least with an equal eye to their Service requirements, and put the National Defense University into that chain of

approval for the things that get done on our various campuses, I think that sounds like success. And it sounds even more like success if they are able to fence a certain amount of funding every year that is specifically for NDU facilities' sustainment, repair, and modernization.

We've already talked about really the other things that that lie above that, "Keep the Eisenhower Hall project on schedule," "Secure the funding for Roosevelt Hall"—we were both surprised and very pleased that the funding came down in the year of execution for Eisenhower Hall. That was enabled by the work of my predecessor, who got the money from the Army to design those repairs in the first place; that gave confidence both to the Corps of Engineers and the contractors who bid on that project that they have a good sense of the scope of work.

We're following that same path with Roosevelt Hall. So, with Ms. Kolbe and her team getting the money from the Army this year, this past fiscal year, and awarding that contract to design those repairs for Roosevelt Hall will give us confidence in the number—the amount of money we need to inform our stakeholders that is required to repair Roosevelt Hall. We don't know that we will have the firm numbers on the cost requirement in fiscal year 2023. If we do, we will go after the money in 2023 and year of execution. It's more likely to slip into fiscal year 2024 though, quite frankly.

Below that, the next major subobjective is "Hiring." We have gone over 85 percent. In terms of—if you do the backwards math—the vacancy rate is now less than 15 percent, so that means we're more than 85 percent filled. We want to get to 90 percent or above. I've been told the federal standard is about 92 percent to 93 percent.

Gen (Ret.) Schwartz: Nora, please.

COL Marcos: On the next one, "Reduced time to hire," why would you have a quantifiable goal for fill rate and not have a quantifiable goal to reduce time to hire?

Lt Gen Plehn: It's a great question. There is some artificiality associated with just picking that time to hire. McKinsey, who did the organizational health diagnostic for us, gave us that information on vacancy rates and here's the average time to hire across the government. I am not averse to setting that goal, but that also becomes a goal for the people who do the actual work inside of the organization. Ms. Kolbe, with the Chair's permission, would like to respond.

Ms. Kolbe: General Schwartz.

Gen (Ret.) Schwartz: Please.

Ms. Kolbe: Thank you. We do actually have very specific targets for Title 10 and Title 5, so we will absolutely add them here, but that is what we are aiming for and that's what we're measuring against.

COL Marcos: I would say at a minimum match which you did last time. Optimally you double it, but giving our folks something to strive for is what leaders do.

Ms. Kolbe: Absolutely, thank you.

VADM Breckenridge: General, if I could take you back for just one moment to facilities. We've talked about the Army War College and particularly, the Army War College and the new building they have. But I don't know that we've ever explicitly had a conversation about their funding models. So, for both West Point and the Army War College and the Naval Academy and the Naval War College, in their funding streams, do they have money put aside for them, fenced off for them for facilities?

Lt Gen Plehn: Thank you, Admiral Breckenridge. I cannot speak specifically to how each Service does what they do, but anecdotally, here is what I have observed, if that's a fair enough observation. The Army War College is the primary mission at Carlisle Barracks. The US Naval Academy is the primary mission at Annapolis. Naval War College is a primary mission at Newport, of course they have Surface Warfare Officer School and a lot of other things there as well. Particularly for the Army War College, since that's the primary mission of the installation and the installation commander is Army, they are part of the Army's facilities investment program, and they get a voice in that process every single time the process runs.

Here at Fort McNair for the North campus, it falls under Joint Base Myer-Henderson Hall, not Joint Base Myer-Henderson Hall McNair. Just Joint Base Myer-Henderson Hall, so that should tell you something right off the bat. There are also other missions resident here on Fort McNair that include the Military District of Washington; that include the Inter American Defense College; that include the Army Center for History as well.

Just by the bureaucratic structure or construct, while we think NDU is a primary mission for Joint Base Myer-Henderson Hall, maybe McNair in the future, it's not necessarily viewed the same way through the Army process. Which is why I think we need a separate agreement with not just the Army here at Fort McNair but with the Navy down at Naval Support Activity Hampton Roads that gives more status and standing to our NDU requirements.

Gen (Ret.) Schwartz: And it needs to be a corporate deal; this can't be a local issue. This needs to have institutional support from the Army and the Navy. In the case of the Air Force, obviously the Air Force Academy is a primary mission, and it has a line item. But I think that there are always exceptions to the rule and just one quick vignette. The Chapel at the Air Force Academy is having a major renovation. It turned out that there were significant asbestos issues that were not anticipated and so that required separate negotiations in order to deal with the escalation of the cost of that renovation. So, the bottom line is that this situation is somewhat unique in that there's a debate about what the primary mission is, and that's something that flagship agreements with senior leadership of the Services could resolve.

Lt Gen Plehn: Thank you very much. Then to your final point on the wargaming piece, Admiral Breckenridge, I think that belongs as a goal for me and the University—not sure exactly where to put it, not sure exactly how to go about it other than to continue to make known the fact that we think that this is a significant portion of our future and our way ahead for NDU Next. I would note that Army War College has an excellent wargaming facility, standalone 140,000 square feet Collins Hall. The Air University has a separate standalone wargaming center. Both of those all the way up through the most sensitive classified information level down to unclassified level, and I think a similar capability for the National Defense University is warranted. As we continue down through “Hiring,” then you see the “Budget,” we've talked about many of the elements of the budget as well. Let me ask if there are any questions.

Gen (Ret.) Schwartz: We have a question from Zoom land. Please.

Dr. Howard: Thank you very much, General Schwartz. As a fellow Zoomie, I smile every time you say that, so I appreciate that. I also want to go on record that the Air Force Academy will be defeating Army in football in a few weeks. I want to get that on the record. ***audience laughter***

My comment, actually General Plehn, goes to Admiral Breckenridge's comment about funding for the Service academies. In particular, General Plehn or General Schwartz, you pointed out the line item, etc. I would say that I know all the Services do this, but I wanted to speak specifically to what West Point has done; it's not that the other ones haven't. Several years ago, and this goes back to the point of the alumni and other sorts of outside support, West Point decided, you know, we want to compete with MIT and with Stanford, not just with Army and Navy, etc. And they knew that what was coming from the federal government was incredibly important and necessary, but insufficient. So, they've been very aggressive in raising funds to make their facilities commensurate with the best civilian universities in the country, if not the world.

Years ago, I was at an event with former Secretary of Veteran Affairs McDonald—a leadership conference that I was part of with him. You sit in Jefferson Library, and it looks like one of the greatest libraries in America because of the alumni and fundraising. So, Admiral Breckenridge to your point, it's all the flagship things that the General's talked about and our Chairman's talked about plus for the Service Academies, and it's not just West Point, but I just thought they are really an exemplar when it comes to doing what it takes to take their facilities to the next level. I just wanted you to know that.

Gen (Ret.) Schwartz: And I thank you. The point you make is notable for the NDU Foundation because there is an alumni, obviously for all the all the schools, and certainly fairly senior now. And so, that is something perhaps to discuss with the Foundation on how to better engage the alumni.

Dr. Howard: Thank you very much, General Schwartz.

Lt Gen Plehn: Thank you, Dr. Howard and thank you, General Schwartz. And General Schwartz, that's exactly where I was going to go with my comment. The NDU Foundation is a 501(c)(3) nonprofit organization, who under the leadership of their President and CEO, Mr. James Schmeling, really has generated some great forward momentum over the last couple of years, and it is on an upward trajectory to support NDU. They view as their primary purpose to close the gap between appropriations and requirements, and they've been very supportive of us over the last year or two.

I have had this discussion about the wargaming requirement at NDU with the NDU Foundation President, as well as some of the members of his Board. They're somewhat excited about the opportunity here. There are a number of ways that we can go about getting after this requirement once we've more fully defined it. I have asked Mr. Kligge, our Acting Director of the wargaming at the Center for Applied Strategic Learning, to help us scope out that requirement so we know what we need to ask for, over.

Under "Budget," I think I said executed 99+ percent again in FY23, just as we've done in FY22 and FY21, and then continue to advocate for sufficient resources. I already talked about updating the average work-year cost. That's a conversation we have to have with the Joint Staff, but it can't be a zero-sum discussion. I mean they could agree with us and say you're absolutely right—calculate your civilian pay budget to the executed work-year cost and then take it out of your existing O&M budget. That's going to be really hard and actually will be unexecutable because, as we sit here today, about \$0.50 on the dollar goes to civilian pay. I already told you about \$0.20 or so goes to information technology and another dime, \$0.10 or so, goes to other must pay type contracts. That leaves very little left over for books, travel, and all the other things that you would associate with a high-quality academic education.

We've talked also about the reimbursable cost model that informs International Military Education Training (IMET) funding. We had a very good discussion at breakfast this morning with Ambassador Myrick and Ambassador Harrington and Ambassador Hoover about as we add more international students, we need to make sure that the costing model is keeping pace with the increase in personnel and overhead costs. And have that discussion with not only the Army Security Assistance Field Training Activity, which really is where the money flows through to us, but with the Defense Security Cooperation Agency and then with the US State Department, because all IMET funding ultimately begins in the State Department budget and then flows through into DoD and into the countries from there. Then that begs the case for the larger stakeholder discussion because this is not the DoD budget, this is the State Department budget. We have to have that conversation with them as well as Congress and others.

"Enterprise Data Management Platform," ladies and gentlemen, it's off schedule. It's over cost, and it's behind schedule. Ms. Kolbe and her team are doing a lot to stabilize that program and get it back in the channel. But that's part of what we need that additional \$13 million for over the next three years, is to help get that program back on schedule. That is going to help connect together many of the data systems and other systems that we have that will allow us to be more

data-informed and data-driven in our decision making. We do want to complete Milestone 2 in the year 2023. I don't think we'll be able to complete Milestone 3 in 2023; it just does not look doable to me. The original projection was for it to be complete in September of 2023. That's slipped out at least six months at this point.

You see another subobjective under "Information Technology." To the extent that we can put more fidelity into these goals, as Colonel Marcos noted, the easier it is for you to hold me accountable for whether or not we're getting these kinds of things done. And then all the other senior leaders who are in the room right now can expect that those will be in your performance objectives as well.

COL (Ret.) Marcos: The one thing I would add, well, information technology, the consideration for cybersecurity should be added there as a standalone bullet in my mind.

Lt. Gen Plehn: Do you have a more refined formulation of that?

COL (Ret.) Marcos: Not right now, but I'll come up with one by the end of the day.

Lt. Gen Plehn: OK, thank you. I would note that we already comply with DoD level requirements on cybersecurity, and our system is accredited through the Joint Staff J6.

COL (Ret.) Marcos: Thank you, then maintain. Let me talk to some folks here, and I'm sure I'll get some suggestions.

Lt. Gen Plehn: Thank you very much. "Strategic clarity," also a recommendation from McKinsey on our organizational diagnostic, and it is one of the four fundamental areas that they outlined to us that if you don't have this right, you're going to have a real hard time improving your organization. So, we do intend on publishing the new strategic plan. It's been well underway since I arrived here, quite frankly. And our intent is to actually publish that by the middle of November. The whole self-study work, that corpus of work that Dr. Yaeger and Jamie Orr just talked about, we're using that to help refine what we have in the strategic plan right now. You will see our three lines of effort reflected in there. You will see your two approved strategic goals reflected in there as well.

"Culture, Climate, and Diversity," I talked a little bit about this in the *State of the University Address*. We have good procedures in place already for dialogue with faculty and staff and students on an ongoing basis, certainly cognizant of the survey fatigue approach. But the important thing with surveys is not doing them, it's what you do after you get the results. Last year, Ambassador John Hoover, our Senior Vice President, served as the champion for the DEI, the DEOCS correction, the DEOCS working group—three different working groups that were really kind of self-organized from those who were interested in those particular topic areas. I anticipate doing a very similar thing after we get our DEOCS results here in the next three or four weeks.

We have been working on a DEI strategy now for quite a while. We've had a contractor help us with that. It is basically finalized, and now we have to figure out exactly how we want to go about implementing that. I would be happy to update you at the next Board of Visitors meeting on where we stand with that in six months.

I intend in 2023 to also administer the DEOCS survey. We did the first DEOCS survey for NDU in 2021. The most recent one before that was 2019. I committed to the faculty and staff that we would do one every single year that I was here, because we have no way of fixing problems or issues if we don't know about them. This is their open channel of communication to me and the rest of the leadership on any issue.

“Communication” will continue in all of those areas, and I know some of you have dialed into the faculty and staff town halls. You've seen some of the all-hands emails. If you have further suggestions for me on how to either improve or amplify communication messages, happy to do that as well.

I think that may lead us into the next one. The third and final line of effort is “Developing our team.” I made one macro category called “Professional Development Opportunities” because it encompasses so much and so many different areas. You know, certainly “Sabbaticals” are a key element for faculty at any university. I almost turned off every single sabbatical at the beginning of this year because our student to faculty ratios were not where they needed to be, and if they're not there for too long of a period of time, the joint staff J7 will reduce our enrollment to get us back into that band. Some people talked me off the ledge and said, hey, you know, if we can at least get close to that, are you willing to entertain sabbaticals? We had that discussion, and we've established the university policy that if your component can maintain a 3.75 to one or better student to faculty ratio, you can approve sabbaticals for your faculty. Indeed, we've had at least two approved for this year.

You can see on “Personnel Development Courses” that personnel development comes in a number of different areas. For staff members especially, it's continuing to develop their personal skills. There's a “Management Development” area to that. There's a “Leadership Development” area. These are areas we've discussed, but we have not yet implemented stringent programs for those. I would like to make those available. Those do come at a cost as well—and monetary cost as well as the time cost of having that individual out of the classroom or out of the staff section that they're in.

And then finally, an area that we don't really have formalized at this point in time, but I think is a good growth area, is a “Mentoring and Coaching Program.” With as little formalization as you can put into that, it just gives it a structure that says hey, here are the following people who are interested in being mentors or coaches either at staff or faculty level and line them up with other people who want to have that kind of interaction. We do a lot of this informally, but I think if we

formalize it just a little bit, put just a little bit of structure in there, we can make it even more powerful. I think, Mr. Chair, that is it for the goals I have been laying out for 2023.

Gen (Ret.) Schwartz: For the members of the Board of Visitors, while this might seem too micro, I think the key point is that, without any coaching from me, this was the President's view of his goals for 2023. I think it's fair. It's comprehensive. And so, what my hope was this morning was for us as a Board to endorse the President's goals for 2023. What we will do with regard to 2022 is I'll ask Mike to give me his assessment of output regarding the 2022 goals, and then, I'll develop a narrative on performance and have that done before the submission to the Middle States in January. If the President decides to cascade this within his organization, that's his choice, but this is our obligation, I think, with regard to assessing the performance of the President. Yes, Ma'am.

COL (Ret.) Marcos: Mental health for students, it's not called out. I know it's an implied task. I know you had a student death and sympathies to the NDU family and specifically the Eisenhower family. I know that happened last year. Obviously, you learned lessons and implemented them. Need to reinforce those lessons and continue to focus on student mental health, whether it's called out here or implied, but we need it. When you have colonels come here, they're taking a knee. But that means different things to different people. This is an opportunity for them to restore their mental health, and I think it should be. It's an opportunity to do right by all students.

Lt Gen Plehn: Thank you, Colonel Marcos. We do have a Health and Fitness Division that includes a behavioral psychologist. When Sarah Langenkamp was tragically killed at the beginning of this academic year, certainly we offered this support, as well as the support of the Chaplain and others, to those who requested it. It's possible for us to make some level of explicit goal regarding health and fitness and commitment to mental health. I'm just not sure how to measure that. Certainly, if you all have some ideas on that, I would love to hear that as well.

Gen (Ret.) Schwartz: Ambassador Roemer.

AMB Roemer: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. This has been a very, very good session, a productive session. Two comments, General. One would be, in my experience with universities that really turn the corner and implement great new programs, forward vision, and recruitment of the best of the best, it comes down to the leadership team that you're able to recruit and retain and motivate and reward. And I'm very happy to see that in this evaluation. I would really underscore and emphasize that—what this board can do to help you facilitate that and implement that leadership team. The impact that the leadership team has on the entire University is just profound as to what you can accomplish in the months and the years ahead. So very good that that is included in here, and I would emphasize it. Dr. Chris Howard is a great example of having somebody recruited to Arizona State University that can make a big difference in what they're able to achieve and bringing new ideas forward.

The second point I would make, probably comes if you're a surgeon, you want to operate; if you're a carpenter, you want to pound nails; if you're a former member of Congress, you want to think that, you know, Congress is a solution to some of your problems. And as I look down at your alignment, hiring, facilities, funding your goals—I agree with all those goals—that the funding from Congress is key. Your relationship with Chairman Milley is key. Your funding from Congress and your Foundation money, those align with your leadership team and you know being able to fulfill your goals moving forward.

You have \$30 million for the Roosevelt Hall that you're going to get, we hope. You have \$50 million for Eisenhower. You have \$13 million request over three years. Building that Congressional relations here at the university, Mark Phillips is terrific. I'm sure he would want more people on his team. Are you restricted from how much you can build out that team and hire out that team? With this kind of money on the line and with the Defense budget under great strain in the next five years with the Ukraine war, cyber threats, China's rise, we want to make sure that you're up there getting your share of money from Congress, where you get most of your money. I would really encourage you to look at this whole aspect, as you are, and I applaud you for the congressional relations work you're doing. But what authorities do you need to expand that in the years ahead?

Lt Gen Plehn: Thank you, Ambassador Congressman Dr. Roemer. ***audience laughter***

AMB Roemer: You're buttering me up now. ***audience laughter***

Lt Gen Plehn: I think you should be standing here as far more qualified than I. However, I think we have the authorities we need. What we have is the really difficult trade space discussion that really revolves around civilian pay. I talked to you a little bit about that earlier and the work-year cost. As of yesterday, we had 308 direct funded civilian personnel at NDU that come out of my civilian pay budget. We are authorized up to 391. If we apply that new work-year cost of \$161,500 to our workforce, I can only hire 337 people. So, as we sit here today, I can only hire 29 more people, if everybody were to stay.

We already have an approved hiring list that has about 80 names on it right now because we're anticipating about 60 departures again this fiscal year like we had in the last fiscal year and like we had in the last fiscal year before that. That was really some great work that John Freeman did when he first came in and said, well, you need to kind of look at your attrition model to help you figure out what your hiring model is going to look like. It's proved out to be very useful certainly over the last year or so.

And I would note that John is on detail from the National Geospatial Intelligence Agency. They helped us out a lot by picking one of their HR stars and saying, as long as you pay us for his salary, he can work for you for a couple of years. So, we have tried some really creative approaches. Ms. Kolbe, over the last 20 months that I have been here and I know for her entire tenure, has pulled out some really creative approaches like that. But I think this one is going to

be a money trade space thing. I would love to have another two or three folks working with Mark on this.

Gen (Ret.) Schwartz: Thank you, General. Debra go ahead and then we'll take a break.

Ms. Debra Wada: I was going to restrain myself and defer as a former staffer to the former Congressman, but I have to just make two comments. Just a reminder, Congress can be very helpful, but be careful what you wish for because what you send up may not necessarily come back. Always remember that in the back of your mind.

The second piece of that is be very careful, again, and cautious because the federal government and the laws do not allow federal agencies to lobby Congress. And there is a fine line between lobbying and educating and informing. And when you start pulling additional funds specifically for Congressional relations, it causes an awareness among particularly, maybe not necessarily members of Congress, but definitely the staff as to what the money is being used for when it is illegal to lobby. So, I would say it's something that we probably...It is necessary to educate and inform; we need to do it in a way that is proper and does not cause more concern or perceptions that are not necessary.

Gen (Ret.) Schwartz: That's very well stated and, my recommendation, Mr. President, is that rather than expanding your own team, if I may Ambassador, that this is to take advantage of the Chairman's team, the existing Chairman's team. So, this requires a handshake with the Chairman, of course. But that is an avenue which has leverage that you seek without the downsides that our notable Congressional staffer outlined.

AMB Roemer: Very well said, both of you. Good, good warnings. I would underscore though, General, that education and branding supplement your work with General Milley's staff and with Congress. And you couldn't be more right to make sure we stay on the fine line of not lobbying, but members of Congress need to know who you are, what you do, and why you're so important to the future of joint education and the protection of our country.

Lt Gen Plehn: Yes, Sir. And thank you to both you and Ms. Wada as well. Mark has been keenly engaged with Joint Staff Legislative Affairs in laying out our Congressional engagement approach to help keep us on the right side there. Thank you, Mr. Chair, for that suggestion to leverage them more.

Gen (Ret.) Schwartz: Ladies and gentlemen, may I suggest taking a break. Let us come back at 11:15, and we will run the last module before our lunch. Thank you.

1115-1200 **Performance Management: Faculty**
Kathryn Kolbe, Chief Operating Officer

Ms. Kathryn Kolbe:

Good morning, General Schwartz, General Plehn, and Board Members. I'm going to give you a brief overview this morning of the NDU Performance Management Process, after which my colleague Dr. Bryon Greenwald will speak to you specifically about Faculty Performance Management.

<Slide 17>

The NDU Performance Management Process is a collaborative communications-based process where employees and managers work together to plan, monitor and review employee performance, with the aim of both developing our team and aligning the work of our employees with NDU strategic goals. The performance management process involves 4 key steps: a performance plan with performance objectives, a formal midpoint discussion along with regular dialogue, a final evaluation completed by a rater and a higher-level reviewer, and recognition with Special Act Rewards and End of Year Performance Awards. Next slide.

<Slide 18>

Currently, most Title 5 and Title 10 employees conduct the Performance Management Process within the digitally based Defense Performance Management Appraisal Program, or DPMAP. Approximately 24 senior leaders are evaluated on an Army Performance Evaluation form here at NDU, which is not incorporated into the DPMAP digital platform.

Our plan for this academic year is to evaluate everyone except the senior executives within DPMAP and to establish a certified performance evaluation system for senior executives. Related to performance management, role clarity was identified during our last organizational health survey as a priority practice and an area that requires improvement at NDU. Therefore, we have established an initiative to focus on ensuring position descriptions are up to date and that supervisors understand how to create and align performance standards with position descriptions and strategic organizational goals. Next slide.

<Slide 19>

NDU has identified several ways to improve the effectiveness of the performance management process with the largest opportunity being in the planning phase. Greater emphasis is being placed on establishing performance plans within 60 days of the start of the cycle to ensure employees begin each year with a clear understanding of expectations that meet smart criteria—criteria that are specific, measurable, assignable, realistic, and timely and are aligned with the overall NDU strategic goals. Also, timely completion of midterm feedback and final evaluations will be stressed and linked to performance awards. Next slide.

<Slide 20>

Linked to performance management at NDU is our annual Talent Management Review Board, which takes place in August every year. The purpose of the Talent Management Review Board or TMRB is to evaluate past performance and develop plans to ensure that adequate resources exist to support future operations. Topics covered include performance management, performance awards, civilian and military staffing, demographics, and appointment renewals for Title 10 employees.

Components recommended this year that 85 percent of Title 10 staff and faculty be renewed for an additional 3-year term. This is slightly higher than in 2021, where approximately 78 percent of Title 10 staff and faculty were recommended for a three-year extension. Academic promotions were also considered this year, and 14 instructional faculty were approved for promotion and 13 non-instructional faculty were approved for promotion.

If there aren't any questions, I'd like to pass the mic to Dr. Bryon Greenwald our Deputy Provost, who will speak with you specifically about the principles around faculty performance management.

VADM Breckinridge: If I could, just a question on renewal not requested, any common threads there that may be of interest?

Ms. Kolbe: We went back and looked at the renewals not requested. Several were retiring. We didn't see any particular issues related to the renewals not requested. John, did you want to comment on that at all?

Mr. John Freeman: It was retirements. Retirements, resignations, and seeking other positions were the three categories there that we saw. So, no concerns, generally expected, these are folks that are moving on to other opportunities or retiring.

Lt Gen Plehn: Mr. Chairman, may I make a comment?

Gen (Ret.) Schwartz: Please.

Lt Gen Plehn: One logical question that also emerged from this was, boy, you're keeping a lot of your folks. We also asked the question what's the average length of time, particularly that someone stays here on the faculty since we don't have tenure. And that number came out to be slightly less than seven years. We have a number of folks who have been here for 20 plus years, but there is a fair amount of turnover every year.

Ms. Kolbe: Thank you.

Dr. Bryon Greenwald: Let me get this as close as possible here. Thank you very much. My name is Bryon Greenwald. I'm the Deputy Provost and look forward to talking about faculty performance management this morning.

General Schwartz, I'm cognizant of the time, and so, if we get up close to the lunch hour, I'm happy to stop, and we can pick up afterwards either with the rest of this discussion or questions. Also, I feel very much obliged by my upbringing to say, "Go Army" and to issue the challenge to the "winged members" of our party and the "flipper part group" of the party to meet me in the beverage hall afterwards to settle up. ***audience laughter***

<Slide 21>

Kathryn talked about the process, so let me focus on the bottom part of the slide there, the evaluated areas, if you will, categories. The *Teaching, Research or Scholarship, Engagement, Service, and Accountability*, what we call around here our TRESA standards. This example covers faculty and researchers, but I'd like to point out that librarians, wargamers, and others have very similar standards. For example, instead of necessarily *Teaching*, it might be *Librarianship, Research, Engagement, Service, and Accountability*.

Beyond the annual performance evaluations of faculty and staff, these evaluations serve two important purposes. The first is at the year-end when supervisors obviously look at the results of the rating and the conversation they have, and they decide about year-end bonuses and the like here, with step promotions and time-off awards. Additionally, I'd like to offer those are not the only awards we have within the University level. The President, the Provost and Chief Operating Officer have Special Act awards that they use throughout the year and at the end of the year. As well, Ms. Kolbe has just engineered and we're about to kick off, I believe, our semiannual awards process, which actually begins at the lowest level and goes all the way up to the 06 GS-15, AD-04, AD-05 level. So, it's really a step forward for recognizing our employees, which will get after some of that retention as well.

The second area or aspect of this performance evaluation in these areas is that it should help the faculty and the supervisor plan out and set a course for achieving the requirements for the next promotion. And that happens over a series of years. For example, imagine I'm a young—I'd like to like to imagine I'm young again—Assistant Professor. I should sit down with my supervisor and discuss how we collectively will build my portfolio across the TRESA standard, so that in four or five years when I apply to be an Associate Professor, I stand a really good chance of having met all the requirements and therefore be selected for promotion by the Board.

It's an agreement and a contract, if you will, between the individual and the supervisor, the Dean of Faculty, for example, at the College, on how you're growing and professionally developing your civilian faculty. Things like, what's my teaching load? Do you want me to focus on certain areas? What type of research do I want to do vice what type of research does the University or the College need? Where will I do it? What deliverables do we want me to work on individually

or collectively? And then similarly, what engagement and service goals can I expect and how can I help the College and the University in its mission?

Again, this becomes a year over year discussion with your supervisor so that you're building your progress toward the next Promotion Board. It also allows the supervisor a contract to keep me, the Assistant Professor, honest and accountable for meeting those goals. Again, set high standards, achievable, well-defined goals, treat people professionally, provide them the resources they need, and let them get after it; and that's what we're trying to do here with our faculty and our staff. Slide please.

<Slide 22>

So, TRESA, let's talk about what these mean, and I'll go over them in general. And if there are specific questions, I'm happy to entertain those. The Provost's Office, the Deans of Faculty, and the Faculty Advisory Council—I'm very happy to say in a very collective effort—worked and are continuing to work to refine what each one of these means, and you can read the words on the slide.

Teaching excellence is relatively straightforward. We've left it up to the faculty to marshal the argument. They are faculty, after all. They should be able to make a hypothesis and support that hypothesis to marshal the evidence and build a convincing argument toward their teaching excellence. Generally, a strong argument would include course surveys; annual performance ratings; peer observation and feedback; unsolicited student faculty observer feedback; as well as supervisor checks on appropriateness of grading—in other words, are you being evenhanded, or are you giving out all A's, or is everybody near the cut line; the quality and timeliness of your feedback—because it's not what the grade is, as much as it is the time the faculty spend with the individual student and their student product to help bring them to the next level; the quality and volume of advising; the quality and quantity of participation in student growth outside of the classroom—you're attending an overseas trip, are you an active participant in the students' education, or are you just along for the ride, as an example.

Research/Scholarship is an area where we continue to refine our standard in both quality and quantity. Likely examples include your traditional book or peer-reviewed articles or monographs, widely used curricular materials, case studies, new scenarios, handbooks, classified and unclassified policy strategy planning documents, conference presentations and, even if we extend ourselves a little bit, you know, influential podcasts.

Engagement and by that we mean meaningful outreach and interaction with other colleges, components, universities, and organizations within your discipline with the intent of establishing broader professional networks, sharing research and best practices, and advancing the knowledge and reputation of your College Component and the University—sort of, as somebody was talking about earlier, extending the NDU brand and then bringing, you know, outside information back in to help you in the classroom, helping administration and other areas.

Service includes actions to support the College, the Component, and the University beyond one's normal teaching duties. That includes examples such as being a Course Director; a Deputy Course Director; serving on college or university boards and councils and committees; assisting our J7 in evaluating other Colleges within the University or outside the University—you know, those old Army folks would consider the archetype of a flyaway team or something where you're going off and doing the ORI or the inspection and assistance visit with other PME institutions; as I am for Bill Eliason, the Director of our Press, a reader for his proposed articles; and organizing student faculty affairs.

Accountability goes without saying, it's simply treating each other with professionalism and dignity and respect. Slide, please. Thank you.

<Slide 23>

As noted earlier, Academic Affairs held an expanded Promotion Board Cycle this year that included the traditional teaching or “instructional” Promotion Board for Assistant to Associate, Associate to Full Professor, as well as our first fully executed non-instructional Promotion Board designed to give our other academic professionals an opportunity to advance. To do so, Academic Affairs led a work group that included the COO, the Chief Financial Officer (CFO), Chief Human Capital Officer (CHCO), the Deans of Faculty, Faculty Advisory Group, Staff Advisory Group, and members of the senior instructional faculty such as our Dean of Libraries, Director of Wargaming, University (IR) Institutional Research Director, and the Director of INSS, all to revise and rescope our promotion requirements. I brought a copy with me. This is a double-sided version. It's rather thick, rather detailed, and it's a work in progress as you would imagine, but it's set the standard for how we were evaluating faculty, and we're going to evaluate faculty in the future.

Then, Academic Affairs, the COO, the CFO and CHCO built the base plan—what are the base University policies? And then we convened groups with the Deans of Faculty and what I will call the low-density managers—the managers of the Library, Dean of Libraries, Director of INSS, and Director of Wargaming. What are the professional standards and professional timelines to achieve those standards for the smaller groups of professionals that we have within the University? So, we established time in grade and time in service and professional standards that everyone needed to achieve to advance to the next higher grade, and then we held a Promotion Board for both of them.

You can see here the other thing we did was we streamlined and decentralized the authority to the Deans of Faculty to promote their what we call rotational faculty, our military faculty, and our Memorandum of Agreement faculty (those are the faculty that the agencies give us in exchange for tuition-free load) from Instructor to Assistant Professor. This was something that had come to us I believe in last year's DEOCS survey and elsewhere that we have people who have master's degrees, they have a year or two teaching under their belt, either here or elsewhere, but they're carrying this title of Instructor around. It was a little bit of a morale boost,

if you will, for them to have the title of Assistant Professor, given certain constraints, and so we decentralized that to make it easier. The Deans now approve that; they check their credentials, and they forward it to the Provost, who forwards it to the President.

We just finished all of that today, and you can see the large number of individuals here that we promoted from Instructor to Assistant Professor and the others as well. I'll have to add that I think it's been a very big morale boost for the non-instructional faculty in particular, who have not heretofore had that opportunity to do that, and so, we look forward to continuing that. We've got more of the specifics to refine for some of our professional groups, and we look to expand that in the near future. The next board will be in May, for example. Next slide, please.

Lt Gen Plehn: Mr. Chairman, may I interject please? This was one of my goals for the University for 2022—to hold a Non-Instructional Faculty Promotion Board. As most of you are familiar with at a very senior level, you don't actually do the work. You ask insightful questions and make profound statements and a bunch of people go scurry off and do the real work. Bryon Greenwald was the person who scurried off and did the real work for 12 months with the rest of the team here. And I just want to thank him once again for making this a reality.

Dr. Greenwald: Thank you, Sir. Next slide, please.

<Slide 24>

Besides promotions, taking care of quality people, if you will, removing a rock from the rucksack, also takes care of good people, and its key toward retaining our best quality folks. Some of that has to do with reducing the teaching faculty load, which means, frankly, getting more teachers and more instructors.

This time last year, we were not very good. You can see on the left-hand side of the slide the standard is 3.5. At the War College, level is 3.5 faculty, excuse me students, to every faculty, and we were well above that almost across the board. We were in the proverbial doghouse with the Joint Staff J7 routinely because of this, and there are a lot of factors. I won't belabor them but the hiring process in particular. And General Plehn's emphasis has really driven this down, in addition to the great work done by the COO and the CHCO, in terms of streamlining the hiring process, getting rid of some unnecessary documents, and making things faster.

We are now very close to having all the schools in compliance. JAWS in purple is hamstrung a bit by the tyranny of small numbers, and you're going to learn a little bit more about JAWS this afternoon. It has a faculty authorization of 13 and a student body of 45, and they're now currently at 11 faculty. And so, it's just one person can make a significant difference between meeting the standard and not meeting the standard. Conversely, Eisenhower School in gray has done an excellent job of hiring over a dozen faculty this last year. But they've also benefited from having a smaller than normal student load, about roughly 20 or so students, which makes the denominator smaller, and so that helps too.

But importantly, as General Plehn mentioned, the vast majority of our schools are now below the 3.75 internal NDU standard that he is willing to underwrite to allow our faculty, civilian faculty in particular, to get out and kind of reboot themselves and refresh themselves with the traditional or nontraditional sabbatical. Last year, only one college was able to do that—this year, three more to include CIC, which will do their first ever sabbatical this year. INSS runs our Sabbatical Board; Denise Natali will run that. It'll be in January 2023. The middle of December is the deadline for folks to get their proposals in, so we look forward to that. Next slide, please.

<Slide 25>

Another thing we tried to do is (we cannot) cast our net wide enough when we're searching for talent. That's brought up earlier, and this is an example of the things we've done recently to do that. All of our hiring starts and finishes at USA Jobs. That's the standard site that everyone must apply to, but it doesn't mean that we have to stick with that. Previously, we were using the USA Jobs and to a small degree the Chronicle of Higher Education. This year we expanded that to include academic discipline sites: the American Historical Association, Political Science Association and three diversity sites—Journal of Blacks in Higher Ed, Women in Academia, and the American Association of Hispanics in Higher Ed.

We also began using LinkedIn this year. We did this for a very modest price of about \$14,000, which when you compare it to a \$50 million civilian payload, is less than—I did the math—0.028 percent. We probably could jack that up just a little bit given what we're actually spending in civ pay. But this was a first-year effort, and you can see the numbers here. Let me orient you to the chart. Next to the journal name, you'll see in parentheses the number of jobs placed with that journal, then the total number of views. So, for example, the American Historical Association: we placed 15 jobs with them; we had over 10,000 views, that roughly makes up 61 percent of the views.

Now that is, that's like bombs dropped. That's an input that doesn't necessarily get us what we need to do better at this. This is all a journey, and this is a step forward, but it's the beginning of the journey. We have not had luck necessarily with one of the sites, the Hispanics in Higher Ed. We've selected another site. We also want to expand this to get a broader reach to other sites as well. Again, we view these hits or views as really just inputs. We need to go further.

One of the problems we have, or difficulties/challenges, is gender and ethnicity determination when people apply to USA Jobs. So, you apply via an ad you see on the Journal for Blacks in Higher Ed or American Historical Association; it says go to USA Jobs. You enter that process. You have the option—it's not mandatory—to click the radio button for your gender or ethnicity and that information is not communicated to the hiring manager.

So, we need to try to do some forensics afterwards. The first time we find out if you're a man or a woman or of a particular ethnicity is when generally you show up for an interview. We can do a little bit of this when we get the list of files and names and things like that for gender. Even that is not precise nowadays. And so, we've got a ways to go, and I look forward to feedback on how

we can improve this process. At the end of the day, our goal is to recruit for diversity, hire for merit, retain for excellence, and promote for exceptionalism.

Gen (Ret.) Schwartz: Dr. Logan, you have a question?

Dr. Greenwald: Dr. Logan, you're muted. Sorry, we can't hear you.

Gen (Ret.) Schwartz: Still muted.

Dr. Greenwald: Perhaps we can field another question, and maybe in the chat or something, Joycelyn or Tammy, you can help.

While we're working that, I want to give a shout out to Tammy Dreyer-Capo in the back. She's actually the person who's pulled all of these advertising sites together. Nothing in the government is easy. Some of these sites are all different; they have different requirements, and of course, our contracting requirements are very stringent. And so, I turned to the list after we received some feedback on it from our DEI contractor as well as the Department of Defense Human Resource Agency Diversity Operations Management Center, who NDU is working with to develop (like ethics) DEI learning objectives for all the senior level PME schools. They looked at our list and sites and said I think you've got a great start, and then, I turned the whole thing over to Tammy to make it happen. So, thank you again, Tammy. Sir.

Gen (Ret.) Schwartz: Dr. Logan want to try again? No joy. Okay.

COL (Ret.) Marcos: Do you have a feel for how many applications this generated?

Dr. Greenwald: That's part of the problem, Ma'am. We get the views, but then we know roughly how many applications we get, not the linkage between a particular site and the number, the exact application. Having applied for a few jobs here at NDU, I can tell you that when you go in and click, it will ask you if you want, "How did you hear about us?" But the only option is, with regard to this is, Internet, so it doesn't get very specific. Thank you.

Lt Gen Plehn: Mr. Chairman, may I interject? This is important for a number of different reasons. A piece of information that you have not yet heard from us is the Diversity Equity Inclusion (DEI) contractor that Dr. Greenwald is talking about, who has helped us develop our DEI strategy, took a look at our hiring processes and the outcome of all of that. What they told us was "We find no evidence of any bias in your hiring of the applicants who have applied to NDU for a job." What they did highlight to us, though, is that the applicant pool, the pool of people that we received applications from, was not necessarily reflective of the relevant labor force or that particular category. Meaning, we need to do a better job on recruiting—recruiting for diversity, which is exactly what this is about, exactly what the Dr. Greenwald and Ms. Kolbe have led the charge on, over.

Dr. Greenwald: Yes, Ma'am.

Ms. Wada: I know we talked a little about this earlier this morning. Just you know, for a lot of recruiting, we've gone to sort of technology, to leverage technology, in terms of specifically going after whether it's a region, skill set, using Google or Microsoft or whatever the current technology is today. Is there any thought of leveraging that or is that too cost prohibitive for you?

Dr. Greenwald: We're happy to, I mean, we haven't investigated the cost, and I'd like to follow up afterwards with you about the specifics. We, as I mentioned, probably could elevate our spend plan on this a little bit, and we plan to do that this year. So, that may be certainly an area we need to invest in—in terms of perhaps a Google or a Microsoft-driven effort as well. We also, when we talked briefly about reaching out to HBCUs for example and establishing point to point contacts, that perhaps the Deputy Provost or someone in the Provost's office could establish when to send out to them and leverage those networks.

Also, INSS has a number of researchers that have connections in all of the major universities globally, if you will, certainly English-speaking universities globally, and they also pump out our announcements. We need to get ahead of that curve so that the information gets out early enough so that people can make informed decisions before we open the window for 30 days or so to advertise. So, we've got a little time synchronization action we have to do, but I appreciate that.

Dr. Suzanne Logan: Can you hear me now?

Gen (Ret.) Schwartz: Yes, Ma'am.

Dr. Suzanne Logan: Thank you. Forgive me for jumping in on top of someone when I asked that question. I wanted to go back just with a quick suggestion. I hope this didn't come up while I was out of the room, but Kathryn and I had a conversation a month ago, or something like that, and I think she was onto something really important there, and it could go back into your TRESA formula as well, and that is using your faculty to help out with your recruitment.

Your faculty are known: they go out; they do presentations; they write books; they talk to students; and students remember them later. I think that actually acknowledging that as something that you expect them to do as part of their service to the institution might go a long way to personalize the recruitment and bring in people that they have made contact with and they have observed possibly doing presentations, writing articles, and at conferences. That would increase the interest and numbers and quality across the board. Thank you.

Dr. Greenwald: Great suggestion. Thank you very much. If there are no further questions then, I'd like to shift to talk about games, exercises, modeling, and simulation for a few minutes before lunch. Or, Mr. Chairman, would you prefer a break now?

Gen (Ret.) Schwartz: No, let's go ahead and wrap this.

Dr. Greenwald: Certainly. Next slide, please.

<Slide 27>

CASL is our learning lab, and our Acting Director Ken Kligge is here in case I get over my head in some of this discussion, but it's not the only place that experiential learning occurs at NDU. Experiential learning occurs in our individual classrooms, on our staff rides, and in student travel, as examples. But CASL is the center for the University's effort to build real-world, scalable, and repeatable events with the requisite fidelity to offer meaningful and lasting learning opportunities for all of our students and analysis for our stakeholders. It's an area where we, General Plehn and all of us, believe we can advance in the future. We're not there now. Next slide, please.

<Slide 28>

Since 2018, the demand for this has outpaced the growth of CASL, both in personnel and in budget. This is an area, as I mentioned, we intend to focus and really kind of design the experiential learning of the future, and then hopefully, using all the levers available to us press for that—specifically, a bit larger organization for CASL itself, a greater access to the GEMS software that is emerging, and conversion or creation of classified and unclassified wargaming and innovation space. It's important to note that we trail our competitors significantly at Air, Army, and Naval War College, both in people and in facilities and in terms of classification. It leads into that discussion of SCIF space—classified, unclassified learning, and as a building with an alternate use would not be a bad idea either.

As noted here, the demand for Joint Professional Military Education (JPME) experiential learning, and non-JPME learning, in other words, activities done on behalf of DoD, other government agencies, and international partners, has grown by about 20 percent over the last four years, a slight uptick in the non-JPME portion. But the budget, while having increased, is fine to a certain extent, but the number of personnel is fallen to a third of what it used to be about a decade ago. In AY 23, we hope to grow those personnel by converting 3 full-time contractors that take about 50 percent of the funding into at least five full-time government civilians. They are performing a task that will be an enduring task, and as we've already talked, kind of in an expanding environment, so we don't think we're taking on any risk there to do that.

We've also been working with Microsoft to pilot their virtual wargaming platform, Project Voltron. Ken could talk more specifics about that. I witnessed a demonstration of that on Tuesday. It's quite an amazing system with an enormous amount of capability. If you think back to 2005 when we were trying to come up with pocket translators for languages to field to people down range, now you can have multiple organizations online doing multiple war games simultaneously in multiple languages in a real time translation and speech and text, along with all of the entities and the background data that you would imagine them to have. The civilian world has blown this up, and we want to take full advantage of it.

Finally, as I mentioned, General Plehn is working with the Joint Staff and the Foundation to look at any combination of efforts to expand our space and our ability to leverage and access these new tools, as well as grow the professionals we need to operate them at scale so that we can do what we call longitudinal gaming across multiple seminars, multiple times in an academic year. So, the students can see as they progress through the academic year, “Wow, I did this at the beginning of the year. I learned some more and I tweaked my approach to this problem, which grew slightly more complex, but now I've learned something else.” Now as we get to the follow-on toward the end of the spring, they take another swing at it and they go, “Wow, I've learned some nuanced things, and I've learned some direct things.” It's very experiential, and it's in real world data, and it's something they can take with them when they leave. So, with that, Mr. Chairman, I open for questions.

Gen (Ret.) Schwartz: Let me just make one comment and this is more for planning consideration. There's clearly arguments for facilitization of this part of the academic experience, but another, an alternative use of that space in this town has other, you can gather, support. There are a number of facilities in this town that are alternative locations for continuity of government. I just suggest thinking broadly about alternative uses as you put together your argument.

Dr. Greenwald: Yes, Sir. Thank you.

Gen (Ret.) Schwartz: Are there questions?

Lt Gen (Ret.) Hooper: A quick comment—I'm mindful of the time. I wanted to go back to give you kudos about the promotion policy and to you and your team, General Plehn. It reminded me of something I hadn't thought about for a long time. When I reported to the Naval Postgraduate School—I taught at the Naval Postgraduate School—it was explained to me in painstaking detail that I was not a Professor. I was not an Associate Professor. I was not even Assistant Professor. I was an Instructor.

It didn't bother me too much because I knew I wouldn't be there, but my younger colleagues who were PhDs and who were devoted to being academicians, that placed them in a cast perhaps a little below. So, I could only imagine the huge morale boost it was when you elevated 72 people to Assistant Professor. So, kudos for that, because for those of you who haven't taught at the collegiate level, it makes a huge difference in morale if you can call yourself any kind of professor, so kudos for that.

Dr. Greenwald: Thank you, Sir, and it gets to the point that was made about getting your faculty to go out and recruit that Dr. Logan made, having faculty feel good about it. If rotating faculty, we get about a third each year, go out back to the force and say, hey, they treated me right, helps.

Gen (Ret.) Schwartz: Mr. Ambassador.

AMB Roemer: Yes, Sir. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Back to TRESA and the evaluation of the faculty. I too want to commend you for the “S” part of the *Service* part of that, to the degree that your faculty is encouraged and promoted by serving the community here. They are getting out and branding NDU, not lobbying, branding NDU.

Ms. Wada: Education and informing.

AMB Roemer: Whatever word we want to use. ***audience laughter***

Ms. Wada: The correct terminology is education and informing.

AMB Roemer: Always willing to learn from very good staff, very good. So, you know the things like podcasts, testimony before Congress—if they're going up to testify, that that's rewarded. Policymaking, Counselors to members, they don't have to testify. They can come up and brief members of Congress about wargaming and CASL and GEMS and the kind of things that really peak people's interests that are going on here that really live up to what Congress passed this law about joint education. That program you mentioned where there is simultaneous translation language across countries of wargaming and classified and unclassified levels that really is cutting edge and that will really get people's interests. So, to the degree that you can do that, podcasts, social media, again, educating about the National Defense University and the great assets and the people here.

The second part is a question to you directly—sabbaticals. I know some universities can use sabbaticals to reward their faculty members and say you're going to go over abroad and you're going to study and you're going to do research or you're going to teach. To what degree can you go out to the Academies, to universities, to historically black colleges and universities, and say we want to recruit your faculty to teach here for a year or two and do exchanges? Is that something that takes 2 years to do or is that something that you could turn around fairly quickly?

Dr. Greenwald: We have the ability to do that, but we haven't really executed it. And I think you, Sir, raised a great point, which is an exchange. Nobody's going to give us a faculty member for free, nor can we necessarily afford it, but there's that exchange. Because then it also expands our brand elsewhere, both on the receiving end and here as well, and so that's a great suggestion. We're giving one up and we're bringing one in, so we're tangent on our student faculty ratio. But if you will, it does help because it expands our horizon by bringing a non-traditional faculty member in, perhaps to get to know what NDU can provide on a large basis but also work individually with faculty. We've got 3 international scholars right now: a Korean, a Japanese Fellow, and a Latvian Fulbright scholar here as well, but we can clearly expand to other universities within the US and work that program. Thank you.

Gen (Ret.) Schwartz: Final comment before we break for lunch. You know, it strikes me that there's a possibility for when you have people who are devoted to corporate citizenship, or in this

case, university citizenship, and if you reward that, it's amazing what the result can be. So, with that, ladies and gentlemen, let's break for lunch.

1200 – 1300 LUNCH BREAK WITH STUDENTS

[AFTER LUNCH]

1315 – 1345 Overview of Joint Forces Staff College (JFSC) Brigadier General Voris McBurnette, Commandant, JFSC

Gen (Ret.) Schwartz: Ladies and gentlemen, welcome back from lunch. I hope you enjoyed the interaction with the remarkable students, including those from other countries that we enjoyed at our table. That was special.

Now for Brigadier General McBurnette. We're grateful for the opportunity to hear about the quote “South Campus” and the mission of the Joint Forces Staff College, which some of us had the privilege of attending too many decades ago. So over to you, Sir.

BG Voris McBurnette: Thank you, Sir. Welcome, everybody. Welcome back from lunch. Before I really get started, I heard the conversation about football and all those things, so I'm not really going to talk about that game. I just want to let everybody know that I'm from Philadelphia, and we still have the only undefeated team in the NFL, and I've got a baseball team that's in the World Series.

Gen (Ret.) Schwartz: I can tell you from personal experience that a World Series victory does a whole lot for a town.

BG McBurnette: And you have no idea about Philadelphia. ***audience laughter***
Everyone, I'm Brigadier General McBurnette. I've been in position for fifteen months and it is my pleasure to start off the Joint Forces Staff College briefing today.

<Slide 31>

This is the agenda. Basically, what I'll do is kind of give an overview of the school and then go into talking about our non-JPME II producing school, which is a Joint Command Control and Information Operations School or otherwise known as JC2IOS. Next my director will talk about Joint Advanced Warfighting School and then I have one of my senior professors to talk about Joint Combined Warfighting School. I had to bring him along because he's my institutional knowledge, so if you ask me a question that's too hard or too far back, I will defer to Dr. Jones, and he will have the answer. ***audience laughter***

BG McBurnette:

<Slide 32>

In the 1930s, few officers were qualified, either by training or experience, to engage in joint operations. The demands of World War II brought out an urgent need for joint action by ground, sea, and air forces. To alleviate the friction and misunderstanding resulting from the lack of joint experience, the Army and Navy Staff College (ANSCOL) was founded in 1943. ANSCOL conducted four-month courses that were successful in training officers for joint command and staff duties.

After the war, educational requirements for the armed forces were fully examined. Although contingency planning was recognized as essential for waging war on the joint combined scale, ANSCOL was disestablished.

A joint committee was appointed to prepare a directive for a new school. The directive, which was approved on 28 June 1946, established the Armed Forces Staff College (AFAC). Responsibility for operation and maintenance and facilities was charged to the Chief of Naval Operations. Following temporary residence in Washington, DC, Armed Forces Staff College moved to Norfolk, VA, in August of 1946. The site formerly known as the US Naval Receiving Station was selected by the Secretary of War because of its immediate availability and its proximity for all of the high-level activities that were surrounding it. There were 150 students from all services in the first class. They assembled and converted administration buildings on 3 February 1947 to be greeted by the 1st Commandant, Air Force Lieutenant General Emmons. The faculty officers came from joint assignments from all over the theater in World War II.

Armed Forces Staff College was assigned to National Defense University on 12 August 1981. In the summer of 1990, AFSC changed its name from AFSC to Joint Forces Staff College (JFSC), actually that took place on 30 October 2000.

<slide 33>

Just as NDU North is perfectly situated for its missions, JFSC with a focus on Joint Operational Warfighting is perfectly positioned.

- JFSC focuses on teaching students how to operationalize strategy across the full-spectrum of conflict, developing adaptive, competent, and confident problem-solvers, planners and leaders.
- 54 percent of all annual JPME grads come from JFSC and 57 percent if you count the reserve components.
- JFSC is a very exercise heavy school, leveraging contextual, facilitated, collaborative problem-solving exercises across the curriculum.
- JAWS students that graduate get coded into JDAL designated JAWS billets and are in high demand.
- JCWS satellite seminars are well received by combatant commanders and have many advantages to keeping the nation safe.
- Getting the right student to JPME-II at the right time continues to be problematic. Less than one half attend prior to their joint assignment. But when I talk to them, when I go out to visit them, they all see the value in having this course prior to their actual assignment.

<Slide 34>

JFSC's mission squarely focuses on educating our students in the joint warfighting and operational levels of war. Depending on the academic program, we accomplish this by focusing on military history, national and operational level strategy, campaigning and the joint planning process. A central aim of our JPME-II programs, as intended by law, is instilling a joint attitude and perspective in every graduate, where each not only knows how to work jointly, in a joint environment, but also values jointness and joint operations.

We graduate joint practitioners, many of whom go directly into joint duty assignments, where their joint skills and knowledge can immediately be applied. Because of this and also our origins of JPME-II programs tracing back to the Skelton Panel in the late 1980s, we consider the college to be the model of JPME-II education—the benchmark by which all other JPME-II programs should be guided to.

<Slide 35>

We believe in the value of education provided by Joint Forces Staff College programs. JFSC programs are responsible for producing, like I said before, the majority of the annual JPME-II graduates for the Department of Defense, approximately 925 per year with a full complement of faculty. Though, until very recently, college throughput suffered from many shortfalls from its military and civilian faculty ranks.

While our graduates possess a firm understanding and competency with joint planning processes, this is not the entirety or the principal aim. Our emphasis is on joint collaborative planning exercises and approaches driven students to become operationally-minded joint warfighters who can think critically and create innovative joint solutions to complex military problems.

Our component difference from NDU is that whereas this base is governed by the Army, our base down south is governed by the Navy. Our command difference is that we have three schools that we operate under that one umbrella. We have different schedules, different modalities, and different requirements.

Curriculum differences: while other components teach JPME-II as an element of their curriculum, at JFSC it is the primary focus. Title 10 US code directs JPME-II/ Joint Matters as the foundation of the JCWS curriculum. JAWS mission is to develop expert planners on JPME-II topics. Extensive experiential learning leads to a greater faculty workload for us, but that also helps with our role in the acculturation and the college process, because the students are able to work together more during those exercises.

<Slide 36>

Our geographic separation makes JFSC more than just a component of NDU, it actually makes it a mini NDU. Our installation support requirements are different and it comes from a different service altogether. Like I said before, the Navy. I'm not going to bang on the Navy right now, but I think that you know there is something to be said about how the Navy focuses on their ships versus facilities. It is very hard for us to get certain things done in that arena.

JFSC faculty is primarily comprised of joint-qualified military officers and Title 10 civilian professors, many of whom are also joint-qualified. Like other components, JFSC has its own institutional research and instructional design division. We also have a dedicated writing instructor who supports the student research and writing efforts across the three schools, and we have a dedicated faculty development specialist, though that position right now is currently unfilled.

JFSC also has a Dean of Administration who oversees the College operations and also supports the provided matrixed and staff departments. JFSC does not have a dedicated Dean of Students like most other component schools, and this places additional responsibility on the Dean of Faculty and Academic Programs and the Dean of Administration. While the College has dedicated onsite support from ISMO, CASL, the Registrar, and the Library, we currently do not have personnel on site from HR or NDU Support Services.

<Slide 37>

The curriculum from JFSC program stands distinct not only because it reflects the unique mission that JFSC has but because JPME-II is a primary focus of JCWS and JAWS programs. JPME-II content directed by statute and department guidance is clearly distinguishable in both—JCWS as it represents the entirety of its curriculum.

<Slide 38>

Although you're going to receive a detailed program overview from JAWS and JCWS, this graphic illustrates the broad organization and orientation of the three JFSC schools. In each, the curriculum specified focuses on the operational level of war within the lens of the school mission, guides students in practical application of strategic guidance, and directs also by the joint doctrine. I will defer to them to talk specifically and give those explanations.

Our JC2IOS program operates under the guidance of Joint Staff J7/J6, though many of its short courses educate officers to be practitioners of information operations and military deception in support of joint planning operations and efforts.

There is a tremendous difference between the length of programs for Joint Forces Staff College. Our JAWs program is a ten-and-a-half-month program, which then we run into having our JCWS program which actually has four ten-week programs, and then that's the resident course. The hybrid [JCWS] course is a 40-week program that actually has three weeks of resident built into it. On top of that we also run a satellite program that runs concurrently with the resident program that's happening in Norfolk. And that is established to help with combatant commanders keeping positive control of their people while crises are going on in the world, where they can actually have their people there onsite and do something with them versus having that standoff time of recalling someone. It also helps with the fact that we aren't through having throughput issues. We weren't able to continuously have the standard of having people actually come and work at the time of need. Ideally it would be good for people to come and take the course in route to going to their assignment, but with the throughput issues, we haven't been able to do that. So, that is another function of satellite, to get these people trained so that they're not working at COCOMS just doing on the job training.

<Slide 39>

This is our manning summary. Basically, the takeaway from this is we basically employ more military personnel in lower ranks than the other schools, and our biggest deficit comes from JCWS. Now as a part of this too, one of the initiatives that I had to take on, coming in as the Commandant, was assess where we were, because we were actually really low, and no one was actually taking responsibility for throughput. I had to go out to my place that had the least amount of people coming in, which was the Navy, and talk with them about making the jump back up to where they should be. When I came in, Navy's manning for instructors was only 55 percent, and as of today, it is 83 percent. So that's a good news story, as it leads to us going into our new classes that start in January by having us able to increase by two seminars going into that.

<Slide 40>

This is our master academic schedule. I'll just let you look at that for a couple seconds just to show you the complexity of what we offer any given day.

<Slide 41>

The course that is not JPME-II is JC2IOS and I just wanted to give a quick overview of that so that everybody understands that we don't just have two schools, we actually have three. Basically, JC2IOS is an information operations school that works, and this is what General Plehn was talking about earlier, because the majority of what we do here is classified. On our 4th deck, we have an area that's all setup, and basically we have a lot of space, and we have convertible space too, to be able to do classified operations. Basically, what happened with their manning, is that their manning is lower than it should be—one of the things that we've been working on. But during COVID, what we were able to adapt to was

to have the faculty go out to COCOMS and work with them there. That is one of the things that actually worked on increasing our throughput from what we used to provide.

<Slide 42>

As you can see in the in the corner of that slide there. And we also get some operational help because as far as funding to go out to those COCOMS, we're actually getting that from the Joint Staff to assist us and going out and doing that.

<Slide 43>

That ends this session for this portion of the session. Are there any specific questions for me? Or you can hold your question until the end after we finish with the other two programs and go from there.

Gen (Ret.) Schwartz: A quick question if I may.

BG McBurnette: Yes, Sir.

Gen (Ret.) Schwartz: To the extent that you can address this in this forum. I noted that military deception is a component of the J2IOS curriculum.

BG McBurnette: Yes, Sir.

Gen (Ret.) Schwartz: Is it the only place where military deception education occurs in the department?

BG McBurnette: I do not know the answer to that, Sir. I can research it and find out.

Gen (Ret.) Schwartz: I'm just curious.

BG McBurnette: Maybe this is a good time for me to phone my friend and ask Glenn Jones. ***audience laughter***

Gen (Ret.) Schwartz: Be my guest.

Dr. Glenn Jones: Sir, I'm not sure if it's taught anywhere else throughout the community. I'm not a hundred percent sure, but I can check with the JC2IOS and ask that question, Sir. I believe throughout the community there are other programs that JC2IOS is well integrated with, and they're out in the community. I do not know for sure. We'll find out, Sir.

BG McBurnette: Yes, Sir.

AMB Myrick: Thank you very much. Would you explain whether there is a formalized operation between what you were doing there and the COCOMS? I heard you say training before going to assignments. Is it more structured than that?

BG McBurnette: From what my research is, this was something that was basically set up prior to 2008, and it changed in 2008. After that, basically people in some of the positions were more concerned with getting people in to work, than that they actually went to the school prior to coming. But one of the things that I've noticed over time of being the Commandant is that when I talk with those students—I talk with them before their class, and I talk with them when it's over—at the conclusion, one of the things that came up is they said, “well, Sir, you know, when I was working here prior to taking this class, my aperture was

like this [gestures small aperture]. I basically did the things that they told me to do. And if I knew it, I did a little more. But now I understand all the authorities and everywhere where things come from. Now I see this much [gestures much larger aperture], and I can maximize my efficiency and time in doing that work.”

Lt Gen Plehn: Mr. Chairman, if I may interject. Ambassador Myrick, some of this is, a lot of this is largely a personnel assignment sequencing issue from the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine, and Space Force. They have to build in that four-month time period to send those officers to the Joint and Combined Warfighting School before they send them to whatever that joint assignment would be. Take myself as an example. I was assigned to US European Command as I came out of senior-level education in 2005; went directly to European Command; and was there for nine months before EUCOM sent me to Norfolk to go through the Joint Combined Warfighting School. That happens a lot.

BG McBurnette: Yes, Sir. I actually spoke with J7 the other day about this, because this is basically a Services driven thing because each Service has a different philosophy on how to do it. I had a meeting with them yesterday, and this was a part of my conversation because we have to change that culture. And I was trying to address with them, how can I help you change that culture? What do we need to do? Where do we need to go? Who do we need to talk to, to help to fix this? Because satellite is going on right now. But it is not a solution; it is a stopgap measure, so that's what I'm trying to fix during my tenure.

Gen (Ret.) Schwartz: I think that a point to make is lots of compromises were made during the demand in Iraq and Afghanistan. Given the conclusion of those activities, it is harder to argue that the services can't sequence this properly.

BG McBurnette: Yes, Sir.

VADM (Ret.) Breckenridge: This is a broader question but driven by the discussion that just took place. Is there an overall assessment or feedback loop that comes across the breadth of the schools and where it is intended that the students go and where they actually get assigned? Not offering any judgment, just feedback for consideration of how the education and training is leveraged.

Lt Gen Plehn: Mr. Chairman, if I may. Our Joint Advanced Warfighting School is probably the only example in the JPME enterprise where the students are tied to a specific joint assignment upon graduation. The requirement for NDU in general by law is that every officer who comes to the National Defense University, in residence senior level education, who already is a joint qualified officer, one hundred percent of them will go to a joint assignment upon graduation. Undetermined which assignment that may be. And fifty percent plus one of those US uniformed military graduates who are not joint qualified will go to a joint assignment when they graduate, which is a different issue than the service personnel timing sequencing piece because somebody has to eat those four to five months. You either eat it by cutting your current assignment short, or you eat it on the other side by the new gaming command receiving you four to five months late. When most things are on a summer assignment cycle, somebody's either leaving early spring or showing up around the holidays.

BG McBurnette: Any other questions for me at this time?

AMB Roemer: General, the guy from Philadelphia can easily answer this question. ***audience laughter*** As a relatively new board member, and I would ask General Plehn to think about this one too, give me a sense of what the curriculum was like ten years ago for your students. What was taught? What were our challenges? What were the threats? And what we're doing today and what we might be doing ten years from now? It just helps me get my head around how important this place is and how to explain its

education mission of jointness and evolving challenges and national security issues for our country's safety.

BG McBurnette: Thank you for the question, Sir. I would say ten years ago, we were still firmly into counterterrorism, and one of the things that all of the schools here are charged with is a continuous cyclical curriculum update. Each school goes through their curriculum to say these are factors in which we need to educate our students. Over time, they may have different battle rhythms of how they get to that. For me, this is a yearly thing. I went back through with Joint Combined Warfighting School and Joint Advanced Warfighting School to talk to them about what curriculum changes need to be made. As a part of that, we have worked on our shift to INDOPACOM related curriculum in both schools. Right now we're actually running a beta on INDOPACOM and JCWS, whereas joint Advanced Warfighting School is firmly into that curriculum because they were a little ahead.

The last part of what you asked me, I think that as we build forward, what's on the horizon in the future is going to be dictated by how we shape our strategic plan and how we actually manage what the future looks like. Because in my mind, I can see it where our strategic team works out into the future to look at futures and things of that nature (modernization) and how those things affect us. Because one of the things that that I see for the University is that for us to become the preeminent place that we want to be, we've got to get out ahead of issues and be that institution that people are pointing towards to say, "hey, we want the input of National Defense University on this.

Gen (Ret.) Schwartz: Let me just offer a view. I think the point about focus on CT and counterinsurgency is absolutely correct. So much of us, you know, were focused there by necessity over twenty years. But I also think that in the not too distant past, the curriculum was largely focused on institutions and process. And I think the thing that has evolved is that that's not enough. That it in fact is the gaming and the actual interaction with scenarios that has begun to become the standard of preparation for joint planners and joint warriors. That's the key. Different academic approach entirely. Hopefully you agree, Sir?

BG McBurnette: I do. Thank you, Sir. Are there any other questions for me prior to moving on to Colonel Cooper?

1345 – 1400 Overview of Joint Advanced Warfighting School (JAWS) Curriculum Colonel Carl Cooper, Director, JAWS

COL Carl Cooper:

<Slide 44>

Mr. Chairman, Mr. Vice Chairman, distinguished members of the Board of Visitors, thank you for the opportunity to speak with you this afternoon. I'm Colonel Carl Cooper and it's my honor to serve as the Director of Joint Advanced Warfighting School. Consistent with the mission of National Defense University, the purpose of Joint Advanced Warfighting School is to ensure our Nation, and those of our allies and partners prevail in peace, war, and competition.

Our school was established in 2004 with the express purpose of educating expert joint campaign planners. Originally established as both an intermediate and senior-level equivalent, we fully transitioned to senior level of education in 2012. So today in our 19th academic year, we provide joint senior-level education and prepare U.S. and international military officers, and U.S. government civilians to serve in strategic leadership positions and lead the development of theater strategies, campaigns, and operations, for the

employment of the joint force in support of strategic objectives and policy goals. Through an integrated curriculum focused on theater joint warfighting, we produce historically informed, strategically minded, skilled joint warfighters.

<Slide 45>

As briefly discussed earlier by Dr. Greenwald, our faculty is composed of both U.S. military officers and civilian educators. We are structured for thirteen faculty members, seven military and six civilian. When fully staffed those thirteen faculty members support an annual class size of forty-five students with a student to faculty ratio of just under 3.5 to 1. We currently have two military vacancies on our faculty, and we're executing the current academic year with a student to faculty ratio of just over 4 to 1.

<Slide 46>

For the annual university student size and composition plan, our class is set at 45 students, in the military grades of 05 and 06 and civilian equivalents. Those 45 students represent all five U.S. military services and the US Coast Guard; the departments of Homeland Security and State, the Defense Intelligence Agency, and this year we have joined a student from the Joint Staff. Our class also includes international military officers, and our international fellows this year represent the United Kingdom, the Czech Republic, Germany, Hungary, Lebanon, and Taiwan. Previous classes have included International Fellows from Colombia, Georgia, Indonesia, Serbia, Ukraine and the United Arab Emirates, and next year we anticipate welcoming our first Swedish student to the school.

<Slide 47>

Our academic program is structured to achieve six learning outcomes that support the institutional learning outcomes as well as the desired leader attributes and joint learning areas established by the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. With these six program learning outcomes, we ensure our graduates can identify challenges and recognize changes; appreciate the joint interagency, intergovernmental, and multinational environment; produce strategies and plans; and model ethically guided strategic leadership.

<Slide 48>

Within Joint Advanced Warfighting School, we utilize four thematic questions to guide student synthesis of the theoretical foundations and practical applications of the key themes addressed throughout the academic year.

- What is war?
- What is strategy?
- What is operational art?
- What is strategic leadership?

Our curriculum, therefore, is organized with three core fields of study. Through our Theory and History Field of Study we provide our students with a historical perspective with which to view the future operating environment. Our Strategy Field of Study educates our students on the application of critical and creative thought for the orchestration of ways and means to achieve strategic ends. Our Operational Art and Campaign Planning Field of Study immerses our students in joint planning efforts to address complex ill-defined problems.

Our three core fields of study are integrated over the academic year through our Joint Synthesis Field of Study, with particular focus on strategic leadership, ethical decision making, and campaign design and execution. Our students also complete one research seminar that provides not only an area of focused

study, but provides the academic structure through which our students complete an individual strategic research paper of thirty to forty pages on a topic of national security consequence. At the completion of our thirty-six credit hour program, our graduates are awarded a Master of Science in Joint Campaign Planning and Strategy and credited with completion of Joint Professional Military Education, phase II.

<Slide 49>

Over the course of the academic year our students complete over forty graded assessments that include both written and oral examinations, essays and papers, group projects and presentations, and seminar discussions. Additionally, our students complete three field research trips. And marking a significant change to our program this year, we will travel to the Indo-Pacific, specifically Guam, Saipan, and Tinian. Historically, we have traveled to Normandy and other locations in Europe and refocusing our travel to the Indo-Pacific better aligns with our overall course curriculum as well as strategic guidance.

And finally, as discussed briefly earlier, our outplacement and assignment program is unique among the war colleges. The program requires the services to assign US military graduates to designated joint assignments across the joint force. In support of this program, most of our military graduates each year are assigned to one of the eleven combatant commands or other designated agencies with these joint assignments.

Thank you for your time this afternoon, and I welcome your questions.

Gen (Ret.) Schwartz: Excellent, thank you.

AMB Roemer: Just a quick question. Your international fellows, I did not see India. I love your emphasis on PACOM and Indo-Pacific. Can you go out and recruit the international fellows? Do you have to pay for them if that's possible? How do you strategically try to bring in the right countries as fellows that will be on your wall fifteen years from now.

COL Cooper: The process in which we actively recruit for our international fellows: We support the University's effort in that across all five colleges, and all five colleges have international fellows, and there's a discussion each year with the International Student Management Office that manages the program within the university on those countries that we would like to join. And it's certainly our intent to increasingly broaden the perspective we have in our class by adding additional countries, and India, Mr. Ambassador, is a good idea.

AMB Roemer: Thank you.

Lt Gen Plehn: If I may inject Mr. Chairman, and then would like to offer Ambassador Harrington, the Director of our International Student Management Office, the opportunity to comment. The process by which we bring those 145 international fellows to the National Defense University this year, and every year, is a series of coordinated meetings with not only the Joint Staff (J7), who establishes our size and composition, but individual combatant commands. We take a large steering cue from PACOM, Indo-PACOM, EUCOM, SOUTHCOM, etc. on what countries, and to some extent what programs, they would like to see those countries attend as well. I would call out particularly for the Joint Advanced Warfighting School, the strong presence of the United Kingdom. They are a strong supporter of the JAWS program and regularly look to get multiple people through that program every year.

Ambassador Harrington, is there anything you care to add?

Mr. Matthew Harrington: Thanks, General. The only thing I would add is Indian students have been active participants in the programs on North campus for a long time.

COL (Ret.) Marcos: If I could, while I was at lunch, we had an Australian naval officer and they get, correct me if I'm wrong, but it seems like each service gets one person per, like maybe we'll get someone every three years. Australian Air Force will get one every three years, Army every three years, so they choose where they go, and he was supposed to go to Rhode Island and that fell through. He was able to come here. That's where you have one person from a country specifically in this one, Australia, that has a choice of all schools, and they probably go towards their service.

Gen (Ret.) Schwartz: I would just remind that the relationships that are created in this sort of environment last for a long time. An example in my case was that the New Zealand officer who attended Joint Forces Staff College course ended up being the Chief of Staff of the Army for the New Zealand Army, and that was a very handy phone number to have.

AMB Myrick: Also, perhaps I missed it, do we have students from the interagency community in these courses?

COL Cooper: Mr. Vice Chairman, yes, we do. This year we have three students from the Department of State, one of whom is a foreign service officer. The other two are diplomatic security. We also have three students from the Defense Intelligence Agency, and we have one student from the Joint Staff, specifically the J7.

Gen (Ret.) Schwartz: Thank you again very much. An impressive presentation. Much appreciated. We go now to JCWS please.

1400 – 1430 Overview of Joint and Combined Warfighting School (JCWS) Curriculum Dr. Glenn Jones, JCWS

Dr. Glenn Jones:

<Slide 52>

Good afternoon, Mr. Chairman, Mr. Vice Chairman, and Distinguished Members of the of the Board. I'm Professor Glenn Jones from Joint Combined Warfighting School, and I'd just like to give you a quick overview of what JCWS is and a little bit of its background. It is the course that's most directly tied to the development and time-honored outcomes of the Joint Forces Staff College, in line with General Eisenhower and Admiral Nimitz's original concept. It goes back over 76 years. However, through a series of innovations over the decades, the schools emerged as the largest producer of JPME-II graduates annually throughout the Department of Defense. There are three delivery modalities within JCWS. As already mentioned, we have the resident program which is ten-weeks long. We also have a one-week Joint Transition course for international fellows coming through. We have forty-four weeks of our course material each year in the resident program.

The hybrid program, established in 2004 as the Advanced Joint Professional Military Education (AJPME) program, designed primarily for our Reserve community—National Guard and Reservists in a reserve capacity. They were not on active duty. That changed over in 2016 to offer JPME-II credit, and now we've started to transition and bring overactive members in the hybrid program; that is a thirty-seven week online program. The satellite program was developed during the decade of war. The satellite program was originally primarily to help our service members, who had multiple deployments, have a

little bit more dwell time at home. Initially we were going out to the combatant commands instead of having them come TDY to us, and save some of their away time, if you would, and spend a little bit more quality time at home. It's working out quite well as far as getting the students, who are assigned to the combatant commands, getting them their JPME. The challenge that we do run into is the command wants to keep them. Ten weeks becomes a challenge on two-year rotation cycle, the rotation cycle now has gone to two years, but that should be added onto their two years. There's a challenge and a tension that continues to come out there. Two years should still be two years.

<Slide 53>

Just a quick overview. As we've already mentioned the three modalities, five key assessments throughout the course—and I'll talk about the five components towards the end of what is in the course. You see, normally we have 16 to 18 students in a seminar. The hybrid seminars will have 25 students. We're doing their face-to-face as we occur right now. There are 40 weeks 3 times a year for hybrid. We do their face-to-face almost sequentially in a row. Right now in our building we have quite a throughput of students going on. There are those five core courses: Joint Force Fundamentals, Strategy and Campaign Design, Integrated Contingency Planning, Capstone, and of course, our APE or Academic Publishable Essay. We'll talk a little bit more as we move forward on that.

<Slide 54>

Program learning objectives, a little bit to the question earlier, Sir. We still stay with the planning processes, but probably the bigger thing we're looking at is—I think in PL2-3—you start having us look at the operating environment much more and the strategic environment much more. Still looking at traditional planning processes but we're trying to get outside of that and understand the context much more. Ten years ago we were focused heavy on phase four and phase five operations, that was what was driving our curriculum from the influencers, if you would, the external stakeholders that were telling us to focus on that. PLO5 is still that acculturation, that goes all the way back to the beginning, appreciating across the joint, interagency, intergovernmental, and multinational perspectives.

<Slide 55>

Class demographics. On this left side, you'll see our resident and satellite numbers at this time, and on the right side, the hybrid classes—the three that are currently in session, they're going through their face-to-face. Just as a comparison, the resident numbers as you can see, almost all Active Duties, some of Guard and Reserve. We have Coast Guard inside of our size and composition now, we've got that, if you would, operationalized, so we see the Coast Guard coming through. You see we have 11 international fellows in this class: Cypress, Germany, Republic of Korea, Kuwait, Philippines, Suriname, and Thailand. Over this year we've had quite a few others that have come through the program, and we've had about 104 different countries over time come through JCWS, going back to look at the numbers. What is different this year? First, we have the first woman International Fellow from Germany and the first woman International Fellow from Thailand. We're seeing some changes in the demographics in that direction.

One note, just on the on the hybrid piece, just to emphasize Sir, which is interesting, of course. Can you back up one please,

<back to Slide 54>

When you see the resident numbers and see all of the active component, they're of course coming in as the practitioners, they know their job set well. On the hybrid side, which is unique, we find that we have such a depth in the reservist, just as an example, current and coming through our hybrid program, we have

five general officers, two State Department foreign service officers that are in the class wearing military rank at this point (one serving in England, one serving in China), an MIT Professor, a Senatorial professional staff member, a Department of Justice Special Agent, a State Secretary of Agriculture from Arkansas, and three chief executive officers. What I'm meaning, Sir, is that we find that there's such depth, they can get into that whole concept even more so, just by what they bring into the class.

< Slide 56 >

Curriculum guidance. Just listed there are quite a few of the things that drive us. Of course, the OPMEP (Officer Professional Military Education Policy), is one of the main drivers of our curriculum and what's going on in the modern or current security context. The new National Security Strategy is already being incorporated into the curriculum just as fast as they can operate with it. The Venn diagram, over to the side, just highlights that acculturation is still at the center of what we do. We're trying to make sure that all members of the services can live, work, and play together—General Eisenhower's words, that's back to that core. Of course, we're looking at the education aspect, making sure we are accredited through Middle States and through the PAJE. Preparation, we want to have the right student at the right time, showing up before their joint assignment. That is, we're missing that some now, that's more of a Service issue, but it's something that we always strive to do, to get them as soon as we can. Of course, the preparation piece, making sure they're ready for their first joint assignment. Making sure what they have is what they need when they get out to the commands.

< Slide 57 >

Finally, just a quick curriculum overview. The timeline, the blocks that are there, are for the resident program. They show the 10-week. The hybrid program with 40 weeks it extends it. However, with the online versions, we do have to organize a little bit differently when they extend that because of the face-to-face, to make sure they have the hands-on portion of the curriculum.

Joint Force Fundamentals—It sounds repetitive of JPME-I and II, to a little bit of a degree, there are things that are redundant, but ultimately in some cases JPME-I programs are not always as consistent in delivering that material. And in some cases it's been quite a while since someone has been through JPME-I, so it brings everybody back in line quite well.

Strategy and Campaign Design—Ends, ways, means, we have the students work to build a commander's initial planning guidance for a combatant command. We're shifting to Indo-PACOM but ultimately, we want to get into that level of thought with the students.

Integrated Contingency Planning—Three weeks in the resident program. We take them through the contingency planning process for a very complex problem. We've been dealing with the AFRICOM AOR, with a lot of China focus in the theater. We're moving to Indo-PACOM to make sure we're staying current and relevant with developing events in the world.

Capstone—We go into a crisis exercise and get into some of those case studies that take them also into their current and relevant.

Academic Publishable Essay—8 weeks across the curriculum making sure that they can get to the PLO on writing and expressing very concisely the ideas that they're working. 8-10 page paper.

Ultimately, Sir, we continue to seek to prepare, acculturate, and graduate students who meet the needs of the combatant commander. That is the focus of JCWS, Sir. And I'll stand by for any questions.

AMB Bismarck Myrick: You know, some years ago I looked at this whole process with regard to the satellite presentations and one of the shortcomings was that the satellite environment tended to be less joint than the resident format. So, I'm wondering if that is still the case? How are you fixing that?

Dr. Jones: Sir, we are working to fix that. That is a challenge for some of the combatant commands, in particular, that are for instance STRATCOM, more heavy on one service than others. We work to hold them, hold the combatant command, to a size and comp and even offer to bring others, sometimes TDY in to get the balance. We are working on that. It is still a challenge, but we are much better than we were, Sir.

Lt Gen Plehn: Mr. Chairman, if I can interject on that point from two perspectives. I was the US Southern Command Chief of Staff when JCWS did the first satellite program at US Southern Command back in 2017, I think it was. And they, being the Joint Combined Warfighting School at NDU, said, "here is the composition of Army, Navy, Air Force, Marines, you need to have in this course." So, we actually pulled, not only from SOUTHCOM, but from Marine Forces South, which was co-located with us—and Special Operations Command South, which was down there in Miami as well, to fill out that size and composition. Without those other two commands being that close by, it would have been very difficult for SOUTHCOM to fill out that size and comp. You've put your finger on a very important issue here.

I would like to highlight another aspect that has not yet come out of this discussion, which is the satellite course was really a homegrown idea within the National Defense University. And we largely pay for it out of our own operations and maintenance budget. It does not result in any increased throughput in terms of the number of graduates out of Joint Combined Warfighting School, because we send faculty out to go do that. If we were not to do that program, you would just have 18 more graduates in residence down at Hampton Roads, and none in the satellite program. General McBurnette is taking this as an initiative to discuss with the combatant commands to see if there's some cost sharing model we can work. Most of the combatant commands have been receptive to that thought. And if I may, Mr. Chair, offer General McBurnette the opportunity, if he cares, to comment on that.

BG McBurnette: Thank you, Sir. When I took over as the Commandant, a part of what was being briefed to me was that, you know, satellite is probably going to go away. So, as I received the brief, I was like, well, what evidence do we have that satellite should go away? Have we talked to combatant commands to say that they're not willing to pay for this? Do they see value in it? So, that's a part of what I've been doing as I've been going out and talking to students in the classes that we have now, as I set up meetings with the leadership to see if this is something that they want to do. Because the previous MOAs that they have indicated that, you know, the same thing that, Ambassador Myrick, you were talking about was the composition— all of those things are in there as far, and now we're just trying to add, if this is valuable to you, then we need a dollar amount from you to pay the TDY for our instructors to come out, because I still feel like it's valuable to me on our end, for me to send the instructors to you. It's just that I can't afford to pay their TDY in the future. So, right now we're going through all of that, and there's only really been one combatant command that has pushed back on it, from all the ones that I've visited. Because their interest was to say that "well the services should actually pay for that." Right? But in hindsight, I think that eventually they will get back in with us. And while they're out, another set of combatant commands have raised their hand to say, "Hey, we will take their other slot too, if you don't put the date on and use it." So, all of these things are working out. And I'm just happy that we were able to solve that problem and still basically, you know, help defend the nation, because that is what this ultimately boils down to. Thank you.

COL (Ret.) Marcos: I remember several years, for the NCO courses, we needed to shorten the courses so that of course we had more soldiers available. There was an online component, self-paced, and we were able to shorten I believe it was the advanced noncommissioned officer course. Anecdotally, I've had

friends that have gone there. Everybody values the course, but as you all have said, 10 weeks is a long time. Have you looked at a way you could make it 6 weeks with some self-paced learning? That's the first question. And do you think that would change the perception in the commands that it's too long? 6 weeks versus 10 weeks is, I would think, more palatable.

Dr. Glenn Jones: We have looked at different modalities. Sometimes with the online on the front end it may actually take a little bit longer to extend it. So, we've been working to address how that would play out. We need to study that a little bit more. Yes, Sir?

Lt Gen Plehn: Mr. Chair, if I may interject. The law requires a course of at least 10 weeks in-residence for JCWS.

Gen (Ret.) Schwartz: Why?

Lt Gen Plehn: That I can't answer. But it is actually written into the statute that the in-resident JCWS course must be at least 10 weeks.

COL (Ret.) Marcos: Deborah wrote it. So go ahead Debra. ***audience laughter***

The Honorable Debra Wada: I actually did not write this piece of legislation, but if I recall correctly, the reason why was because there had become, I believe, there actually may have been data that showed that the sort of not being in residence did not give you the sort of the dynamic that you are looking for in terms of creating relationships that was part of what was sold as a benefit to these PME programs.

BG McBurnette: The acculturation.

Ms. Wada: And so, there is a fine balance between trying to be helpful and having people stay at home because of the high deployment, but at the time that was not necessarily the case at that point. And so, there is a belief that you need a certain amount of time to be able to create that relationship that is sustainable. and you don't get that through remote.

Gen (Ret.) Schwartz: Thank you.

Dr. William Eliason: Mr. Chairman, Sir, if I may. I'm Dr. Bill Eliason, the Director of the National Defense University Press, Editor in Chief of *Joint Force Quarterly*, the Chairman's journal, and a representative from the Faculty Advisory Committee. I also have the distinguished honor of having finished my 30-year Air Force career at the Joint Forces Staff Colleges as the second director of the Joint Advanced Warfighting School. And so, I have some history. I believe that was in 2010. Ike Skelton, the man who really in Congress, set up joint professional military education, along with the Goldwater-Nichols Act, as the board member mentioned, definitely fought against this concept of reducing from 10 weeks for JCWS to 6 weeks, which occurred during my tenure between 2006 and 2010 at the Staff College. In the end, acculturation takes time. Like good wine, you can't speed up the process to make better wine. At least that was the argument at the time. ***audience laughter***

The second thing I'd like to say about that program is there have been other things that have gone against it from time to time. There was a period of time, some years ago, where they reduced the paper writing requirement down from 10 pages to 2 because we wanted to produce staff officers. In my role as editor of *Joint Force Quarterly* for the Chairman, in this very room, he asked me when I came on board in 2010. "Bill, here's what I need you to do. We at the highest level of the military, really do not have a direct connection to the people who are actually getting the work done, the 04's, the 05's, and 06's on the deck

plates. You provide us with a channel communication directly from them to us. Please do all you can to find those things.”

Over time, some 400 submissions come to *JFQ* every year. We peer review them and eventually 60 to 75 are eventually published in the four journal issues we produce each year. Of that, approximately 40 percent or roughly 150 to 160 of those submissions come from the students at JCWS at the Joint Forces Staff College. So, you can see where my business model comes from, and I am a shameless promoter of it for the Chairman. But in the end, that course at 10 weeks, even with the paper it currently has back to a much longer one than two pages, provides all of us with insights for the rising leaders wherever they're going to go, within whatever space they're going to be in—before they become the General Schwartz's of the military. And I think that, of the programs we have of the National Defense University, the largest number of them come out of that school, and they are the ones who get the most purple and immediately put it back into the force where it can be best used. And I think that's really quite often very much undervalued. All five colleges do that, but in terms of heavy lifting, our friends in Norfolk seem to do that the most. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Gen (Ret.) Schwartz: And I would just offer this. At least in my experience, others here feel free to comment. The reality is that the means of communication in a staff, a military staff—I think this is probably more true in State than it is on the military side, in the early years or earlier years is written communication. So, if you're making an argument, whether it be for particular employment options, choices, and so on, or making a case for renovating Eisenhower Hall, that Major or Lieutenant Colonel will do that via the written word. It is true that at more senior levels, that whole dynamic flips. It is now no longer the written word that matters as much as it is being able to persuade you and Mr. Ambassador across the table. And so, I think the notion of making sure that people have some magic pens, in their earlier years, is exceedingly important because the American education process is no longer demanding that kind of skill on a broad scale. That's my take, for what it's worth.

COL (Ret.) Marcos: I would just say, it's written into law. Acknowledge that, it was a law that was written 12 years ago. And what has happened since then? Distance learning, remote education, COVID. We're having this meeting, this way, with a dispersed group. Our kids are learning differently, I would say. And the kids are now Majors. And my question would be, would a combatant commander be more likely to send someone through the program if it's six weeks, before they start, than just because they need to send them, so they can qualify to be a general officer? That's a big leap, I know. But there's somewhere in between. It is true, Sir.

I would just say, if you pole people, if you pole your folks that you mentor, the 10-week course, very beneficial. Could it have been done more efficiently? Probably. Did they build relationships? Absolutely. But are we training our people? Are people used to building relationships quicker because they've been in this hybrid environment? I would say, yes. So that's just food for thought.

Gen (Ret.) Schwartz: I take your council.

Dr. Jones: Mr. Chairman, if I could just follow up. With COVID, I taught through seven virtual 10-week programs and we're back into our fourth face-to-face course this year, this class right now. I did the satellite in NORTHCOM in the first class of the year. Looking at the dynamics across the programs and work with hybrid over the years, the richness of what's going on inside the classroom right now, it's amazing. It's amazing to be back in there and listening to the students. Many times the faculty can just step aside and watch the very conversations that you mentioned, Sir. The persuasion going back and forth on particular subjects. When we did it with in virtual and with virtual tools, it was the best we could make it happen, but it was falling short in comparison. It was the best that we could do during COVID. I'm amazed by what the faculty were able to pull off and do, because we never missed a single class or a

single a session whatsoever. The faculty were amazing. But the face-to-face interaction is just absolutely rich. I've watched or listened to students have a conversation coming back from an offsite the other day, and I wish I could have recorded the conversation, as beneficial as understanding each other's perspectives as it was. Face-to-face is really working out quite well. I know that 10 weeks is tough for commands, but what the students walk away with, it's quite amazing, Sir.

Gen (Ret.) Schwartz: Go ahead, General.

BG McBurnette: As a pretty much lifelong educator, I can tell you that school systems are suffering with virtual teaching in schools, versus having students in class. That was one of the things, when I came in, we were talking about, when can students come back to class? One of the things that General Plehn will tell you is that I was pushing to say, "hey, we need to get back into the classroom because the acculturation piece is a key component to what we do."

And the other factor that's not being taken into consideration that we're talking about now, is the distractions that go on with online learning, because the people aren't paying attention. They're trying to chime in, just the same way people telework. You might get your answer back on your e-mail, maybe, but they're not paying attention to what's going on at the point where it's actually occurring. And that's what's being missed by sitting at home and doing something. Because that conversation is taking place right now in class, and what your position is, is being challenged. People rise to that to say, "hey, this is what I think, this is what I think, this is what I think." So that is the nature of planning. And this is what you're actually looking for in your planners, to be able to have those types of conversations and to bring those things to the commander when it's time. Because in this situation, if we just go virtual, then you're not hearing everything, and that is a part of, you know, when you have your different COAs, you have to be able to say this is what I think. This is the secondary, This is the tertiary. Now if we just go with online, you're not hearing all of the extra. There's some extra that's going on that needs to be listened to as well.

COL (Ret.) Marcos: I don't believe I said online. I said self-paced and reducing the in-class time frame. I didn't insinuate at all, it should all be online. That's absolutely opposite from what I said, because I totally agree with you.

BG McBurnette: Yes, Ma'am.

Ms. Wada: Once again, my staffer background. I am giving you all a warning. I would say two things. One is, I think we should always look at our current processes and how we do things, given the changing environment in which we live, because technology has changed the way we do things—to see if we can do things better, quicker, smarter, cheaper. Undeniable. But I will also say, the end state goal of what we are trying to achieve in the quality of students should be what drives decisions and not cheaper, better, smarter, quicker. Because when Congress looks at this, granted, Ike is no longer there, but when those people who are interested in this area look at it, what they are looking for is the quality of student that is coming out and is it worth the investment that we are making in all of these PME schools and whether they should actually continue to be military schools, or whether we should just send them to civilian schools. And so, we have to make a distinction of why we are different, but also that the quality of students that we are coming out with is just as good, if not better, than if we set them to the Harvards or the Stanfords or the MITs of this world. That's sort of the balance that we have to meet because we don't have an endowment like Harvard does, and we have to do it within a certain amount of resources that the federal government and taxpayers give us. That's sort of the balance that everybody here has to face, unfortunately.

Gen (Ret.) Schwartz: Chris, I'll come to you in a second.

Ms. Wada: Arizona State!

Dr. Chris Howard: Thank you.

Gen (Ret.) Schwartz: Let me just comment quickly. I also think that this is also a question of which constituency are you talking to? You might find that the COCOMS, for good reasons, would prefer a shorter course. The services might not. I would encourage you to interact with services as well on this question to sort of get a balanced view of what the career path development strategies are that really are at work.

Dr. Chris, over to you Sir.

Dr. Howard: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. And thank you to my fellow board member for throwing “Arizona State” in, at least for good measure, at the very end. I think it is appropriate to mention us because we don't, and I serve on the Harvard Board of Overseers, we don't have Harvard's, exactly down to \$50 billion with a B endowment, and nobody else does, and nobody else will soon. What the institutions out there, and I appreciate the Commandant's comments about, you know, the ineffectiveness sometime of online teaching, which means turning on Zoom and just talking. I would just submit, and I'm sure that General Plehn has done this and our new Provost will, and I want to invite you out here. There is a whole learning, engineering and science around pedagogy, around either hybrid, online, asynchronous, synchronous, etc. My institution has invested millions of dollars into this, and we're happy to share. And we're not the only one, but you're always going to come out here and take a look. But what we're able to do teaching online, we teach electrical engineering online partially and molecular biology online. These are subjects that were hard enough, you know, sitting back at the Air Force Academy so many years ago, trying to figure them out with a really good professor, with the 15 cadets in the room with you. But all I would submit is that I appreciate all the parameters of the conversation.

I just encourage the Commandant, the President, but especially the faculty members, to commit—and this is where accreditation comes in—is to commit themselves to leveraging these new tools in a way that a school like Arizona State, but not just us, but we're happy to help, have made it better and in some ways we've gotten even elevated and better outcomes, using distributed learning techniques. I put that down there as an invitation and will never take away from the in person face-to-face and the camaraderie that is built there. Thank you.

Lt Gen Plehn: Mr. Chairman, if I could dovetail on Dr. Howard's excellent points there. I forget exactly what comment I made last year when I was visiting the Joint Forces Staff College, I think on my very first visit last April. But Dr. Tony Feagin really made me think hard about this as we started talking about virtual, hybrid, hyflex, in person. He reminded me that what NDU really did in March of 2020 was just push the big red panic button. Send everybody home. Figure out how to deliver our existing curriculum virtually. Which is much different than designing a curriculum from the ground up that has elements of synchronous and asynchronous learning, that has elements of in-person, virtual, hyflex pieces of it. So Dr. Howard, thank you for the kind invitation. I would look forward to visiting you and seeing how Arizona State presumably builds that from the ground up, over.

Dr. Howard: General Plehn, just one other point. We have 173,000 students; 80,000 on our campuses; 90,000 online; 350,000 that we're doing certificates for; and another 25 million that actually accessed some of our pedagogy certificates etc. (they won't do a full course). So just in that, the quality is critically important, and we hold ourselves to account. We're also accredited. But we're trying to do what you just described, General Plehn. We're not perfect. And we look for people to work together with, and we're happy to support, over.

Gen (Ret.) Schwartz: And let me just say that Arizona State is lucky to have you, Chris.

Dr. Howard: Thank you, Sir.

AMB Roemer: Just a quick remark. Colonel, I want to thank you for stimulating this conversation, because you started it by doing what a board should do, and that is, why is this in place? We don't just accept what is on the books, whether it's law, whether it can be changed. And we've had this great stimulating, productive, interesting, fascinating conversation as a result. I'm a better board member as a result of that question, and I think that's exactly the kind of oversight that we want to have done. Thank you for initiating that.

Gen (Ret.) Schwartz: And with that, ladies and gentlemen. Oh, we want to wrap it? OK.

BG McBurnette: I don't want to wrap it, Sir. Basically I have your due out about deception. Each service has their own deception course. We run the only joint deception course.

Gen (Ret.) Schwartz: I'll talk to you offline.

Ladies and gentlemen, why don't we take a break until 3:00 o'clock. So please come back at 3:00 o'clock, and again to repeat what the ambassador said, this was a healthy conversation, so thank you.

[BREAK]

**15:00 Discussion of Public Written Comments
Board Members**

No public comments submitted.

**15:00-15:05 BOV Member Deliberation and Feedback
Board Members**

Dr. Yaeger: We'd like to give an opportunity to publicly hear any board members' last comments, or suggestions, or thoughts. And then finally closing comments from both General Plehn and yourself. Over to you, Sir.

Gen (Ret.) Schwartz: General Hooper, may I ask, any final closing thoughts?

LTG (Ret.) Hooper: No, Sir, except this was a great conversation and to commend General Plehn and his staff for excellent presentations and a clear indication that they are on a clear path and a positive path forward. And I'll stop there.

Gen (Ret.) Schwartz: Thank you, Sir.

Ms. Wada: I just say, ditto.

COL (Ret.) Marcos: Nothing to add other than great as always. Great preparation. Great execution. Thank you.

AMB Roemer: Thank you, General Plehn and your staff. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Thank you, fellow board members. It's only my second meeting and I just think that this is the way a board should function. Kudos to you all for asking tough questions and getting great answers from people making this place work better and seeing success. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

VADM (Ret.) Breckenridge: I echo all previous comments and would add, I think there's been impressive progress since our last board meeting. And I want to compliment the entire staff for looking at the feedback that we gave them but also holding themselves accountable to stepping forward with continuous improvement, over.

Gen (Ret.) Schwartz: Dr. Howard?

Dr. Howard:

Thank you very much, Mr. Chair. I'm going to just very quickly echo what my fellow board members have said, in particular, Ambassador Roemer. I think this is how a board should function, especially a board that deals with such a hybrid entity as National Defense University. We heard comments and questions from board members that went deep into our domain expertise and then came back up just to support NDU, and not every board can do that. So, I just commend my colleagues for that. I also want to lend my congratulations to General Plehn on getting the money. As a university president, senior executive, getting the money is very important to take care of the buildings. Kudos to that, and also to the academic staff on getting that Middle States accreditation done. That is no easy feat, and I wish you all the best in that regard.

Gen (Ret.) Schwartz: Thank you, Sir. Dr. Logan?

Dr. Suzanne Logan: I agree with everything that's been said. And sitting here looking around the room and realizing that, I think Jody and I are about senior on this team, and I would like to not only say you have done an amazing job in over the last period, but probably some of the most forward progress that we've seen from one time that the Board has met to the next. You've got a great team in place. I have great confidence in what you can accomplish and I'm proud and happy to be able to serve with you.

Gen (Ret.) Schwartz: Thank you Ma'am. Mr. Ambassador?

AMB Myrick: Yes, I join with all the comments that have been made. I was particularly impressed with the economic use of time and amazed at how much we got accomplished in this time period compared to other times when we have used more time. But this was a quality period. I was particularly impressed with the inclusion of our colleagues at the Joint Forces Staff College today.

15:05-15:10 Wrap-up and Closing Remarks
General Schwartz and Lieutenant General Plehn

Gen (Ret.) Schwartz: And, Mr. President, would you like to make concluding comments?

Lt Gen Plehn: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And thank you to all the members of the Board of Visitors. There are many other things you could be doing with your time, and I sincerely appreciate it on behalf of our entire university, because you're a key component of any progress that we make. And to that point, my hats off to our entire NDU team. As they've heard me say many times before, this is my 6th assignment in Washington, DC. After number five, I sold my townhouse and I said I'm never coming back, until, they said, "would you be interested in the National Defense University?" And I said, "I will come back to DC for that," largely because it's such a great mission. And what makes it even better, is the

wonderful group of professionals that we get to work with day in and day out. Any progress you've seen over these last six months is attributable to them. They're the ones who are doing the hard workday in and day out, which is why this discussion on the goals for the NDU president, which really reflect the goals of the university into 2023, is such an important discussion for us. Because that will then focus us and translate down into the subordinate goals for each of our components, colleges, and commands. And we look forward to making progress in all of those. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Gen (Ret.) Schwartz: I too would like to offer my sincere thanks to the team. I think one thing that's evident to me is that this in fact is a team. And, you know, compliments to General Plehn for cultivating that sort of chemistry here. Keep at it, you all. Clearly, it's value added in every context. With respect to the to the goals that we looked at earlier, General Plehn sees those as not yet final. And so, with your permission, I think we offered, you know, some good coaching, some ideas for him to integrate before it goes final. We'll obviously share that with you. And the goal would be to complete that in time so that it can be part of the accreditation documentation, if you will. And we'll take care of that.

I have one other sort of comment that's maybe a little bit specific, but it comes to mind. There was a time in our history that strategic deception was a strong suit of the American armed forces. I'm not talking about tactical deception, not battlefield deception, but a different quality entirely. There are entities here, and it's the reason I pressed you on, you know, what is being taught and who the champions of the course are, and so on. It seems to me that in dealing with the inferior adversary over the last 20 or 25 years, certain elements of our strength have diminished, and one of those areas is in strategic deception. And if we were in fact to engage a peer, that capability, you know, at least in my observation—I don't have any classified insight obviously—is underutilized. And so one thing, Mr. President, that I would propose to include in the communication with the Chairman, is simply the observation that this might be an underemphasized discipline at the moment, and one that he might chat with his J3 and his J7 about with respect to how one might assure that this discipline is ready for the strategic competition which we now face.

With that, ladies and gentlemen, and Dr. Yaeger, I think we can close the open session.

Dr. Yaeger: Yes, Sir. One administrative note. The administrative session will occur on the third floor in the McNair Room, so either Ms. Stevens or I will be at the top of the elevator to guide you to the room after this.

At this time this board member meeting is closed to the public in accordance with public law 92-463. Thank you.

[MEETING ENDS]

**National Defense University
Board of Visitors Attendance Roster
October 27, 2022**

1. Vice Admiral Jody Breckenridge, USCG (Ret)
2. Lieutenant General Charles Hooper, USA (Ret)
3. Dr. Chris Howard ([virtual attendance](#))
4. Dr. Suzanne Logan ([virtual attendance](#))
5. Colonel Nora Marcos, USA (Ret)
6. Ambassador Bismarck Myrick (Ret) — Vice Chair
7. Dr. DJ Patil ([virtual attendance](#))
8. The Honorable Tim Roemer
9. General Norton Schwartz, USAF (Ret) — Chair
10. The Honorable Debra Wada



**National Defense University
Board of Visitors Meeting
October 27, 2022
AGENDA**

Meeting Dress Code

Military: Class A Uniform

Civilian: Business Suit

All Times Listed are in Eastern Time (ET)

Thursday, 27 October 2022

Room 155A&B, Marshall Hall + Virtual Access for BOV members only

0900 (ET)	Call to Order – Meeting Starts <i>(Room 155A&B, Marshall Hall + Virtual Access for BOV members only)</i>	Dr. John Yaeger, Designated Federal Officer (DFO) and Vice President for Accreditation and Strategic Planning
0900-0905	Administrative Notes <i>DFO comments/overview of agenda</i>	Dr. Yaeger and General Norton Schwartz, USAF (Retired), BOV Chair
0905-0930	State of the University Address	Lieutenant General Michael T. Plehn, NDU President
0930-1015	Update on Reaffirmation of Middle States Commission on Higher Education (MSCHE) Accreditation: Self-Study Recommendations for Improvement	Dr. Yaeger and Mr. Robert Orr III, MSCHE Steering Committee Co-Chair
1015-1045	Performance Management: Senior Leaders	Discussion led by Lieutenant General Plehn
1045-1100	BREAK	
1100-1145	Performance Management: Faculty	Mrs. Kathryn Kolbe, Chief Operating Officer and Dr. Bryon Greenwald, Deputy Provost
1200-1300	<i>Buffet Lunch with Students (South Atrium, Lincoln Hall)</i>	<i>Board Members, NDU-P, SVP, DFO, and Select Students (invitation only)</i>
1315-1400	Overview of Joint Forces Staff College	Brigadier General Voris McBurnette, Commandant, Joint Forces Staff College

1400-1430	Overview of Joint Advanced Warfighting School (JAWS) Curriculum	Colonel Carl Cooper Jr., Director, Joint Advanced Warfighting School
1430-1500	Overview of Joint and Combined Warfighting School (JCWS) Curriculum	Dr. Glenn Jones, Professor, Joint Forces Staff College
1500-1515	BREAK	
1515-1530	Discussion of Public Written Comments	Board Members
1530-1545	BOV Member Deliberation and Feedback	Board Members
1545-1600	Wrap-up and Closing Remarks	General Schwartz and Lieutenant General Plehn
1600	MEETING ENDS	Dr. Yaeger