REPORT OF

THE NATIONAL DEFENSE UNIVERSITY

BOARD OF VISITORS MEETING

Held on July 11-12, 2017

A public meeting was held on July 11-12, 2017 by the National Defense University Board of Visitors in Marshall Hall, Room 155, Fort McNair, Washington DC, 20319

Date of this Report: August 2, 2017

Lloyd "Fig" Newton, General, USAF (Ret.)

Chair

National Defense University
Board of Visitors Meeting
July 11-12, 2017
MINUTES

The National Defense University Board of Visitors (NDU/BOV) met at Fort Lesley J. McNair in Washington, DC on 11 and 12 July 2017. The attendance roster and the agenda are attached in Annex A and B, respectively.

Tuesday, 11 July 2017

1300: Call to Order, Colonel Richard Cabrey, USA (Retired), Designated Federal Officer

COL Cabrey: Good afternoon. I'm Mike Cabrey, the Designated Federal Officer for the Board of Visitors of National Defense University. The National Defense University Board of Visitors is hereby called to order in accordance with the provisions of Public Law 92-463. This meeting is open to the public until 1630 this afternoon, 11 July 2017. Tomorrow, 12 July 2017, the open portion of this session of the Board of Visitors is from 0830 to noon.

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 the National Defense University in achieving its mission." NDU's senior leaders are present to answer questions or to clarify information as well as to listen to the Board's recommendations.

I'll ask the members of the Board to use the microphones on the table. If the light on the microphone is green, it's on.

I'll now turn the meeting over to General Newton.

1300-1315: Welcome and Administrative Notes, Colonel Cabrey and General Lloyd "Fig" Newton, USAF (Retired), BOV Chair

Gen Newton: Good afternoon. Welcome to all the new members of the Board. We've spent the morning doing orientations, and I think they were pleased. Thank you, Major General Padilla, for the escort around the University. And welcome to everyone in the room, I'm glad to see people here. We'll ask for your comments if there's time. And thanks to the recorders, who weren't expecting me to say this. I appreciate the importance of the minutes. And now, General Padilla, over to you. That's all I have.

1315-1345: Video and State of the University Address, Major General Frederick M. Padilla, NDU President

MajGen Padilla: Thank you. We'll start with the video for an idea of who we are and what we do. We've had multiple open houses to show this to our stakeholders, which I think we'll continue to do. It's tailored to the audience so they're all a little different. We plan to do one for the Congress eventually. Go ahead and push the button on that, thank you.

[video runs]

MajGen Padilla: Great job, Mark Phillips. It's kind of long at seven minutes but we're putting together some shorter versions. I'll now read the state of the University address. I may take the liberty to ad lib a little bit.

[See text of speech at Appendix C]

Gen Newton: Perfect, thank you. No questions? You did it perfectly. Okay.

1345-1430: State of the NDU Budget, Major General Robert Kane, USAF (Retired), Chief Operating Officer; Mr. Jay Helming, Chief Financial Officer

MajGen Kane: Good afternoon and welcome. We're looking forward to presenting our budget update. The budget brief is generally a big hit with the new Board members, though it may be too much for older members. As General Padilla mentioned, last fall was when we began to see the budget cuts show up. What I'll try to do – which may be too much for the older members – is to give a sense of what the budget looks like.

Today we'll stay focused on the 85 million piece. The reimbursable is 100% incremental; everything is recovered and doesn't impact the direct budget. Civilian pay consumes about 75% of the budget, plus an IT contract. We spend a lot of time working on the civilian pay through our talent management process. IT costs are also a big part of what we're trying to contain. Looking at the NDU funding cuts over time, the question now about the cuts is can we get them reversed. We've got a baseline of about 105 million. 2006 was the first time we produced a new President's budget under the new scenario. We're trying to get back to the 2006 level. We haven't grown, but we have been substantially reduced. For those first cuts, we did not have the institutional capacity to do robust internal planning, so those first cuts were not of our design – we were told by the J7 what to cut. It began to put our program overall out of balance. But we had no way to reflect those cuts in terms of impact. Our mode has been to do inflation budgets, with no sense of the cost of doing business. Then came the sequestration budgets, with the 32% reduction, just as we began planning for One University. We had no capacity at the university level to absorb this, which is why we now have a Chief Operating Officer.

This brings us to the red line. Looking at – though I don't like the terms – Management Headquarters and Non-Management Headquarters, these circles represent different support personnel categories. We consciously reduced only about 13% of the non-MHA to retain quality, but we had to take about a 40% reduction on the support side. The red line translates to the Chairman's number below which not to go in order to maintain the student experience and reduce the risk of losing accreditation. This last Management Headquarters reduction peaks in 2021. The red line is for today's operations; it's different from future red lines due to no money to invest in IT.

I mentioned that we did some significant institutional planning. We changed the model of our funding distribution to figure the cost of doing business, divided into some 44 functional programs and capabilities. So instead to giving, say, 45 million to the War College, we looked at funding the Masters of National Security studies and said, what does it cost to deliver that course – full time faculty, travel, institutional research, wargaming, library, academic technology. By breaking it out that way, we could show the true cost of doing business, so you can point to specific programs that would be affected or eliminated and from that the risk of losing accreditation. We can now show how the reductions actually affect the University – how many students can you not support if you lose X number of faculty, when do you lose critical mass in wargaming support.

We used this to prepare our next Program Objective Memorandum (POM). Here's the final result of our POM profile. It required us to break out the difference in Management Headquarters and Non-Management Headquarters. In '15 and '16, and into this year where it looks like things are stable, we

actually had a reduction that was so abrupt that there was no way we could get through that bathtub without some external funding, and we would have had to impose an internal hiring freeze. We needed bridge funding to avoid not hiring faculty. We've got a stable funding profile through '17 from the Joint Staff.

The other part of that discussion was IT investment, getting it into the baseline budget. That is now in the budget also, $3 million. We know it's not enough, but it's a start that the Chief Information Officer (CIO) can work with. We had been relying on end-of-year fallout money for our IT strategy to that point.

Our CIO used to be active duty military who changed out every two years, and there was no strategy. We civilianized the position in 2015. She's been getting her arms around the financial management system, dealing with the ever-present IT security restrictions, getting our systems some capability to get inside the dot-mil environment. Some investment will be needed for the new learning center, which the Provost will discuss. And we've got a small wedge for some full-time-equivalent positions as we update our skill sets.

What it all looks like when you put it together: the dotted line shows where we would have been without the cuts. We're looking to recover the red area and capture the purple area. Without the purple piece, we'll be in the same place we were. So we are feeling cautiously optimistic. We're trying not to overplay, though; we're still about 10 million below where we need to be.

Gen Newton: And when you talk about recapturing?

MajGen Kane: The purple part is new money. The beauty of the situation is we can describe the situation in a way we couldn't before, so it's much more defensible.

Dr Logan: So the purple is, in addition to being new money, an attempt to get the University back to where it was before?

Maj Gen Kane: Absolutely. The 85.7 is a baseline. With inflation, the actual purchasing power is going down by about 6 or 7 million dollars. So we're crossing the red line one way or another without additional funds.

Are there any other questions?

Gen Newton: We have a challenge in front of us.

MajGen Padilla: It's really the result of the work of everyone at NDU, doing program reviews that quantify and qualify what we're doing here. A consistent theme in the climate survey is the weariness that comes from trying to do more with less. Our ability to show the Joint Staff that we have a disciplined process in place gives them a message that resonates. We now have a good story.

Gen Newton: Very good. Let's take a break so we can be really alert for Dr Yaeger, and I'm not alert right now.

1415-1430: Break

1430-1515: Review of the Process for the Accreditation of Joint Education (PAJE) Visits for NDU Programs, **Dr. John Yaeger, NDU Provost**

Dr Yaeger: Okay, sir. On accreditation, which fundamentally is all about improvement. It's healthy to have a group of your peers tell you how you're doing. Without our civilian faculty, we'd be at the

bottom of the heap for competition. The civilian is about the university, the military is about the program. Both systems have standards, as shown here. A downside of looking at numbers – we can't compromise quality just to meet the numbers. The University has been very successful with the academic model of the seminar model. In addition, there's the content. On the military side, there are ten areas the law requires us to cover; the challenge is how much. The civilian side is more about the outcomes – show me that the student learned it. We're successful with that. Here's the report card on how we did:

For the National War College PAJE, the standard to develop joint awareness is yellow due to the small number of Navy students – something that the University could do nothing about. Same thing with too few Navy faculty. We no longer have a Coast Guard chair and that also counted against us. We took a hit on specific items for not hitting certain programs in enough depth. The War College redid their curriculum to cover learning areas that were deemed not covered enough. There is a difference of opinion on that between the Dean and the PAJE team.

At CISA [College of International Security Affairs], the South & Central Asia program is for more junior officers and will be JPME I. Their counterterrorism program got high marks. A lot of the content was there in the curriculum; they couldn't compliment the curriculum enough.

The Eisenhower review – one of the things they really did well was that they could show how they use the student assessments to assess the program, from the student assessments through the program assessment. That's a model I'm asking all the schools to do. Institutional support processes got a green.

JAWS [Joint Advanced Warfighting School] did really well, with enough Navy. It's a smaller program.

A concern for the College of Information and Cyberspace was not enough O6 military faculty, so we went looking across the University for a trade – a Navy O6 for a Navy O5. A concern all the Deans should have is the number of part-time or visiting faculty – there is real value to having the continuation of knowledge you get with full time permanent faculty, of knowing why a reading is included, how a program is put together – we need more focused faculty.

RADM Hamby: The levels you see here are from this spring. You can see from the bubbles that we're already moving to improve this. The program content was praised. We've also worked through establishing a hard line of where our faculty are working so we know we are within the 3.5 : 1 ratio. We're in the second year of the pilot. The students are not affected.

Dr Yaeger: So that's where we are on the process, and I'll be happy to take questions

VADM Breckenridge: To go back to the law that created the standards, what about ten or so years from now, will that 3.5 : 1 still be the right standard?

Dr Yaeger: John Yaeger's opinion is that, where headquarters cuts are going to hurt us, even with the learning center, we're going to need that support. The 3.5 is not just those in the classroom. We do need to look at things differently. In an ideal world, we can get from the combatant commanders how much they really need to know about, say, contract support. The faculty we have now are doing what staff used to. We now count librarians and wargamers and researchers as faculty, as a point-something.

MajGen Padilla: The way we calculate that now is different from the way we used to.

VADM Breckenridge: Regardless of the class size, looking at the requirements of the service mix,

does it always have to be an equal mix of services to meet PAJE standards?

Dr Yaeger: That's right, it's particularly difficult with the smaller programs – do we have a critical mass? My opinion again, we should look at the officers' specialties.

College value propositions, is that where we are?

1515-1615: College Value Propositions, Rear Admiral Janice Hamby, USN (Ret), Chancellor, College of Information and Cyberspace (CIC); Colonel Ann Knabe, Dean of Students, College of International Security Affairs (CISA); Rear Admiral Jeffrey Ruth, Commandant, Joint Forces Staff College (JFSC); Brigadier General Chad Manske, Commandant, National War College (NWC); Brigadier General Paul Fredenburgh III, Commandant, The Eisenhower School (ES)

RADM Hamby (College of Information and Cyberspace): I am very pleased that we are the first up, because this is the first time we get to brief you under the name of the College of Information and Cyberspace. We are in a much different place and time from when the government was trying to figure out how to deal with computers. We have a new crest, of which we're very proud, along with being the only military education institution focused on the employment of information as an instrument of national power. We do undergo the accreditation process and have our JPME [Joint Professional Military Education] II program, and we're getting positive feedback from the organizations that are getting our students. We're focused at leaders at the strategic level, who are providing advice to or commanding the operations of the network, not the ones with their hands on the keyboard. We're looking through the lens of how this man-made terrain is employed by the force. The faculty is emerging as thought leaders. They're asked to speak at events around the world, and we're hosting our own by-invitation-only event. We have multiple stakeholders – here's how they play in informing our curricular needs, and who the emerging stakeholders may be. We're targeting their needs so we get the competencies right for our graduates. We have a range of programs, with concentrations in cyber leadership, cyber security – we have a graduate-level certificate or a full masters, achievable over a number of years so they can be really educated. There is a short supply of potential students and their employers are reluctant to release them. We also provide professional development, with desk-side service to spin up, for example, the J5 of Cyber Command who needed help.

Gen Newton: A typical individual coming for this course – do they have to meet certain criteria?

RADM Hamby: They need to have a current TS/SCI [Top Secret/Sensitive Compartmented Information] clearance. Another desire, though not an absolute, is that they be in the field and rising up in it, or a kinetic officer who is going into this field. We want both in the classrooms because they will need to work together. We have students from across DoD and interagency, so it helps them understand why they need to supply these requirements. We are really focusing in on information operations, very deliberately working to keep pace with, if not stay a step ahead of, it so the students have access to the range of expertise. We don't want someone whose service isn't going to assign a graduate to a position that would benefit from the program. In the second year of our program, the services are improving this. We'll have foreign students in the future, from the United Kingdom and Australia.

General Newton: What is your definition of cyberspace?

RADM Hamby: It's not just of the technologies – the computers, the lines – but how information is exchanged and used across those lines. It's very much an amorphous concept as it crosses all the domains of land, sea, air, space. That's a good piece for our faculty to work on. Information has been identified as a seventh function

Dr Trachtenberg: So you're running a school of theology? So what backgrounds are you looking for – quants?

RADM Hamby: We know the general research tells us the best leaders in this area are not the keyboard operators, but the visualizers of patterns in the data. Liberal arts backgrounds, music theory backgrounds do well. Feedback on multiple years of graduates will allow us to tighten up on the right students, the right curriculum.

Mr Solomon: Are you seeing an increase in demand?

RADM Hamby: We will be looking at how much our stakeholders need cybersecurity at the strategic level and how much at the keyboard level. There's a huge demand for the keyboard level. What are the unique competencies needed at the leadership level? Early conclusions – for cybersecurity, as we work through this year, we will look at how much the competencies overlap. If there's a lot of overlap, will keep a master's degree at the cybersecurity level; if not, we will offer a master's degree at other levels.

CAPT Fraser: If you could get whatever you needed to be successful, what would that be?

RADM Hamby: If the University were blessed with a budget influx, I would like clerical staff, more faculty, and faculty from the private sector who I can't now compete with salary-wise. For faculty, I'd like sufficient expertise and some experience on the outside. I have a core now, but I will need more in the future.

ADM Walsh: I applaud the work you're doing in an area with many gaps in the readiness levels. Looking at what some schools are doing to keep pace, any thought about a way to address the shortfall?

RADM Hamby: We do have a graduate-level certificate, but it's a hefty lift at 18 credits. How do we go from being interesting to being essential? Do we serve our DoD stakeholder better with, say, the bare necessities in a 3 – 4 week program?

ADM Walsh: Look at where you have a leading-edge opportunity with ways of delivering it.

RADM Hamby: Navy and Air Force use our program as a certification requirement. We need to figure out how to package just what each one needs into a 3 – 4 week course that addresses all the needs.

Mr Doan: You need to be more entrepreneurial about what faculty are. The Army guys who built the cloud are retired now. You could get those guys to come in to teach a class. But it's moved past them now, they're archive. You need to be dynamic in finding them.

RADM Hamby: We do pull in guest speakers for one or two days at a time, but we do need faculty to pull the courses together. Now a distributed faculty is an interesting idea, worth investigating.

General Newton: It seems to me this issue is a lot bigger than NDU – where else would this expertise be if not at NDU? It's a DoD issue. How can we get their attention?

RADM Hamby: Kudos to Larry Rzepka at the Foundation, who has been reaching out to industry.

ADM Walsh: Borrow from the proven narrative that operational warfighters make the best instructors. Broaden the aperture, look for where cyber experience resides on the civilian side.

Col Knabe (College of International Security Affairs): These are the major CISA programs. The Combating Terrorism Fellowship Program, our ten-month program, is our bread and butter, with a lot of international students. The other big program is the ten-month South & Central Asia program, which has a number of junior officers, and we also have the programs at Ft Bragg. The ten-month programs require a thesis. We have two certificate programs that run in the fall and graduate in December. The RCNSC [Reserve Components National Security Course] short course is one of the original NDU missions, and one of the most sought-after courses. The faculty are largely reserve component. Finally, we have a short course on contemporary energy and national security, staffed by DoE faculty.

We deliver results by creating strategists and advisers, differentiated in that we do have that thesis. It gives them the opportunity to develop a strategic plan, as the international officers are doing for their countries. We develop effective operators as well, who are prepared to work on a joint staff. And finally, we have a very active alumni network. Our international alumni credit CISA with helping them develop policies to respond to terrorism, irregular threats, and contemporary challenges.

Dr Trachtenberg: Does anyone mine those theses to see if there's anything that can work?

Col Knabe: We have shared some of them with the Joint Staff, and some of the students have spoken at events. There's been some interest as well from the Combatant Commanders' Scholars Program.

MajGen Padilla: About 50% are international officers who come with marching orders to come up with something here that they will be implementing back home. Also about 50% of the JSOMA [Joint Special Operations Masters of Arts] are enlisted. There is a big move to push JPME to the enlisted level. Senior enlisted are attending the JCWS [Joint and Combined Warfighting School] course with their officers. It's a tremendously beneficial experience for all of them.

RDML Ruth (Joint Forces Staff College): Let me begin by quoting another source of learning, Sesame Street – some of these things are not like the other. JFSC has no footprint in DC. There's a lot in our area to enhance student learning – former Secretary Panetta called Norfolk the operational hub of the military. Our Tidewater area has a major presence of all the services, and we partner with those institutions to get our students out to them. We have the Yorktown battlefield, a truly joint and combined battlefield. It provides an exceptional environment to get our students into a JPME world. JFSC provides 54% of the JPME II quals, 57% if you include the distance program. We focus on problem solving at the operational level of war, using collaborative contextual courses. Per the math equation, we provide the cheapest way to provide JPME II to the force. We provide value to our international partners of providing them with a US perspective, and to the US students who understand other countries' perspective, since there is no problem we can solve on our own. Our graduates are known for their planning expertise. They can lead other problem solvers, advise the decision makers and assume senior level positions. They can turn strategy into action.

We deliver our programs through four schools, in session 52 weeks a year. Our JAWS graduates are all going to coded billets – it is our degree-granting program, similar to the programs here in DC. It has 45 students, 2 international fellows. JCWS is pure JPME II, in 4 sessions of 10 weeks. We have a relatively new satellite program that transports the JPME II curriculum to the COCOMS [Combatant Commands]. We recently opened JCWS to senior level NCOs [Noncommissioned Officers], of which we have three. We've had nothing but rave reviews from both officers and senior NCOs in those courses. JCWS-Hybrid is our distance-education delivery of the program, hybrid because of three weeks in residence. That was recently opened to active component, but we're not sure what the demand signal there will be, with O4s to O8s – Guard and reserve are now demanding the JPME quals. Finally, the JC2IOS [Joint C2 and Information Operations School] program is at the tactical level, and is not the same as the CIC. Questions?

CAPT Fraser: About return on investment and proving the worth of the NDU investment – seems to me you are where the rubber meets the road. What are your thoughts, beyond literally living and dying once you go into combat?

RDML Ruth: Looking at JAWS, the demand is there for more planners – the COCOMs want people who can turn strategy into action. Our graduates are making an immediate impact. The Navy's never very good at flowing students through JPME at the right time in their career – from my personal experience, the skills that our officers get are immediately returnable to their staffs. 100% of our graduates are employed doing what we taught them.

ADM Walsh: So the survey data hold up.

RDML Ruth: Yes. And you'll see we were green across the board for the first time.

Dr Yaeger: We are working with Admiral Scott to get the students there at the right time.

MajGen Padilla: That will be a great question to ask him tomorrow. The COCOMS are frustrated at having to send their officers for JPME training in their joint tour. They need to be doing it beforehand. It's like performing surgery before you've been to medical school.

RDML Ruth: SOCOM [Special Operations Command] got their officers through before their joint tour. We can talk and try to get the services to comply.

MajGen Padilla: We're not getting the student flow-through. There were some changes to the Defense Authorization Act last year which should impact things like how long you can be on TDY during that joint tour. We'll see how this works

CAPT Fraser: John, a high level demand and a high level of satisfaction should be a requirement for every graduate of NDU.

Dr Yaeger: There is some uniqueness to JFSC, their JAWS graduates know they are going to a joint assignment. We have a hard time capturing the data that shows the graduates are successful who did not go to a joint assignment

RDML Ruth: We have it easier because our curriculum is designed for this. It's easier for us to assess.

MajGen Padilla: When you talk about the top level schools, if you're an O5 to even get assigned it's about a 20% acceptance rate. You have to have sustained outstanding performance to make the cut. It's the same with the interagency – State uses NDU for its top 50%. You can look at how many become ambassadors or flag officers, but is that the right measure?

ADM Walsh: I'm seeing a huge disconnect between a demand signal for more and a budget that gives you less.

MajGen Padilla: We're pushing that, sir, and we're starting to see some traction. The Chairman and the Vice Chairman, they get it. There's an institutional issue, depending on where you are in the building. To grow strategic leaders is not an overnight thing. Invest in PME when resources are limited, on one side; the other side is just dealing with fiscal bogies and are just trying to solve a fiscal problem.

ADM Walsh: I knew who the NDU graduates were on my staff, but nobody asked me what I thought of them.

BrigGen Manske (National War College): You had a deep dive this morning, so this will be about our value proposition and what we are not. We are a ten and a half month program. I just spent some time with the international officers on their road trip. Our aim is to graduate already high level officers and State Department staff to be strategic practitioners.

What we are not, though – we have a truly joint interagency and multinational faculty and student body, which differentiates us from the service schools. Each semester includes a core curriculum and three electives. When our first term ends in December, we have a comprehensive oral exam where they explain how to get through a national security problem. They have another oral exam at the end of the spring term, defending their individual student research project. We look broadly at the instruments of national power. We're the only school under the NDU umbrella charged with looking at national security strategy. We have a fair amount of State Department and civilian faculty, which is another differentiator from the service colleges.

CAPT Fraser: If I'm an Army officer, is it more prestigious for me, if I want to move to the top, to go to NDU or my senior service school?

BrigGen Manske: Your service makes the decision where to send you.

MajGen Padilla: Looking at our Hall of Fame inductees, not to take anything away from the Army War College, six of the last eight Chairmen were NDU graduates. To come here is a great experience, with true international and interagency experience. The other schools teach national security strategy, but through the lens of the service.

Dr Yaeger: It's about building relationships. As long as we're getting the top, that makes us more valuable.

CAPT Fraser: From a marketing standpoint, do upcoming Naval and Army officers know about NDU? You need to market to them. And for someone with a budget axe, would it make more sense to axe NDU or the service schools?

MajGen Padilla: We are working that. We brought the heads of manpower management and the agencies to show them what to expect from their people after sending them here.

BrigGen Manske: There are a couple of distinctions. 50% of our graduates have to go on to a joint assignment. The service schools don't require that.

Gen Newton: There are a lot of dynamics that play into this. Remember that the services feed this institution, but blowing out their candle won't make ours shine brighter. There's already a slice that's being thought of differently and considered for NDU rather than a service academy.

MajGen Padilla: There's also the stability it offers to the families, to come to NDU. If you're likely to be assigned to the National Capital Region, with a follow-on to the Joint Staff, NDU is worth a hard look.

CAPT Fraser: So where are we in the line to capitalize on our prestige to get the money we need? My concern as a Board member is that we have the reputation to have our hand out when there's money to be had.

MajGen Padilla: We've had both hands out for a while. We are the only school under the Chairman, unlike the service schools that get their support from their service.

Dr Trachtenberg: What were you doing in Montana?

BrigGen Manske: It is truly a field practicum. We had a judge talk to the group about our legal system and the second amendment. They get to see things like how does governance work in an unincorporated town? How does the Park Service work? Then there's the whitewater rafting, where the real bonding happens. No fly fishing, though.

MajGen Padilla: They also go to San Francisco, to Ripley, Tennessee, to New Orleans – the idea is to show them how diverse this country is. There are a lot of Americans who haven't seen what they are seeing. It's a pretty powerful experience, it gives them context for what they see on the news.

BG Fredenburgh (Eisenhower School): I think I am the last value proposition for the day. We are very similar to the National War College, also similar to the senior service schools. We're also a JPME II institution. Where we diversify is in the learning outcomes. The school was established after World War I with the mission to ensure strategic readiness for the nation. Our niche in the joint system is to develop leaders who can integrate strategy and resources – that is what separates us from the others. Also, our senior acquisition course, federally mandated and with a separate funding line, which consists of a core and electives. My understanding of how it differs from what they do at Fort Belvoir is that this is the senior executive acquisition course.

Dr Yaeger: Let me take a stab at that. Remember the missteps in the '80s, when we were buying $300 toilet seats and such. We found that an education system to support the acquisition program was lacking – they had high-school graduates negotiating contracts with skilled lawyers. We needed to get more liberal arts and critical thinking skills in here.

BG Fredenburgh: Another highlight is the industry studies program, with field practicums that allow students to engage with the private sector. We're working with 20 industries and 700 industry visits. The students evaluate and make recommendations. We do distinguished visitor briefings that bring senior leaders in for briefings from the students. We graduate about 300 students a year. The stakeholders are selecting who they want to attend. A typical student is 40 – 45 years old with an average of 20 years in service; a typical seminar has 16 or so students, with a mix of military and civilians plus an international officer and an industry fellow. This makes for a broad perspective in discussion and diverse experiences in an adult learning environment, which results in strong relationships. Not one graduate has not mentioned the power of the network that results. I wish I could find a metric that measures that, but I can't. We've been equated with the MBA for the national security enterprise. Our graduates are informed and adept at integrating the industry component. General Eisenhower understood that no national security strategy would be successful without integrating the industrial component

Mr Doan: Do we have enough industry people here and what are you doing to get more?

BG Fredenburgh: That is the topic of my next briefing.

ADM Walsh: A note to Janice – can you imagine your students looking like this chart from slide 3?

RADM Hamby: We are partnering with the Eisenhower School industry studies. You are spot on, sir.

Dr Godwin: These industry studies map closely to the Department of Homeland Security's critical competencies.

1615-1630: Industry Fellows Recruitment Strategy, Brigadier General Paul Fredenburgh III

BG Fredenburgh: The industry studies fellows program – some industries and companies have long-

standing relations with us. There are two opportunities for industries to be inside. One is our students – NDU is the only school with the authority to allow industry in. We have two tracks for an industry fellow to get a degree here, either one ten-month year or split across two years. The reimbursable cost, about $75,000, is not an issue with industry. The second opportunity is a faculty industry chair. They would help develop the curriculum. That would be a two year position. We had nine students in 2012, then only two this year. It's a lagging economic indicator, a result of the downturn.

It's not the tuition, it's the loss of the revenue benefit to the company, plus salary and possible moving costs, so the commitment of taking someone offline plus the lost revenue. Another issue is lost connections with companies. Companies have moved away from internal development; they'll just buy what they need – though that may be changing. Those seem to be the biggest impediments.

We've been in a rebuilding and redevelopment mode. Frankly, we need industry's voice inside the school and in the classroom. So we've significantly increased our senior leader engagements, targeting the senior vice president level, someone who can make some decisions. We're also targeting globally, where companies are more interested in developing internal talent. We've increased engagement with associations. We are working with the Foundation, they are working with NDIA [National Defense Industrial Association] for funding to endow an industry chair, which would help keep our curriculum relevant. We've increased the pool of CEO visiting speakers. We're taking a look at, if the challenge really is the time, can we develop, say, a short course that would get them here for a shorter time but still have an impact. We've revamped our social media presence for a recurring connection point with the companies to keep the school on their radar. We're emphasizing the advantage to industry of building their rolodex, and help them understand how the government thinks.

We are dependent on the private sector, but our defense industrial base is changing. We have access to government agencies and briefings that a private sector school does not. Our focus is on leadership, strategy, and aligning them. For the next academic year, we had a bunch of possibles but only one industry fellow to date. We would expect more next year, but the area needs work and needs help from the University.

CAPT Fraser: In general it's very difficult to get someone on a fast track at a company to drop out for a year. In the executive MBA world, the only way to succeed is with evening, weekend programs. How do you integrate that with your cohort? Some variation of the executive MBA is what you need. How do you meld this together?

Mr Doan: I think you're going after the wrong people. Go after the people who've already dropped out. Look to the entrepreneurs who are looking for their next challenge, who think defense stuff is kind of cool.

Dr Yaeger: One of the challenges is the law and the way it's written.

VADM Breckenridge: That hurdle may be easier today than in the past. Look also at the Secretary's efforts to involve Silicon Valley.

ADM Walsh: Just go through the parking lots in Silicon Valley. You've got two challenges: content and delivery. You need a sustainable delivery model.

BrigGen Manske: A couple of comments. Value proposition: you have access to senior acquisition leaders in DoD, attractive to military and industry. Incentivize the company to do this – the CEOs need to come up with something to entice the employee.

Dr Trachtenberg: Forty-five is over the hill. Look at younger people with more runway. Law graduates, of which we have a surplus, is a prime pool of potential recruits. Aim for the general

counsel's office of a contractor, or that branch of a law firm. Talk to the law school deans.

1630-1645: Day One Wrap Up, General Newton and Major General Padilla

Gen Newton: We're getting to that point in the schedule for wrap-up. General? We're off to a great start with this session. Thanks for the participation.

1645: Meeting Ends for the Day, Colonel Cabrey

COL Cabrey: This formally closes the meeting for the day. We'll have the group photo out front, then convene back here for the executive session. Dinner will be upstairs in Special Collections.

Wednesday, 12 July 2017

0830: Call to Order, Colonel Cabrey

COL Cabrey: Good morning. I'm still Mike Cabrey and I'll now call the meeting officially to order. Today we have four topics – technology update, review of the cyber curriculum, the climate survey results, and NDU's strategic plan. If there are no questions I'll turn this over to Diane Webber

0830-0915: Information Technology/Academic Technology Migration Progress Update, Rear Admiral Diane Webber, USN (Retired), Chief Information Officer

RDML Webber: Good morning. No CIO stands complete without an outage, and at 0515 this morning I had an outage. It's fixed now, but.

This brief is similar to my last one – we're still in a hole, but not at the very bottom of it. So this is about where we are and where we have been.

We frequently find ourselves using a sneakernet, a lot of what we need to do is still done by hand because our systems are all over the place and don't communicate. We have no integrated data architecture. The classroom technology had been neglected, is not compatible with the laptops available today, and vendors no longer have the parts needed to fix things. We have a way to go before we can start doing anything transformational.

We need a new student information system. We've had several previous failed attempts, though Jan Hamby volunteered her faculty to help. We've got a new Authority to Operate to work this. Our PII [Personally Identifiable Information] systems are not what they should be, so it's very dependent on the individual and people are creating documents with PII. We need to rectify that. We're putting out banners and instructions about once a quarter, reminding people to be careful.

Our infrastructure is unable to support improvements – we could not run the cable for SIPR [Secure Internet Protocol Router] in the boss's office because the power capacity was not up to it. That has to be fixed before we can do anything transformational. CIC is developing programs requiring SIPR and we don't have the capacity to support them. We can't communicate with the Joint Staff on basic business functions.

Three studies have said we are ten years behind our peer DoD educational institutions and 20 years behind the private sector.

We try to keep the team focused on context. Our problem was, we were executing tasks by putting things on the network and ended up with this kluged thing that doesn't work. We're trying to keep the boss's strategy in mind.

We inherited a gap between the infrastructure side and the academic side. As we clean it up physically, we need to have a governance structure in place to see we don't get back there. The guiding principles are to build partnerships to make sure the IT strategy aligns with the NDU strategy and to put governance in place so our decisions make the best use of scarce resources. In addition to being a strategic fit, the solution needs to be ergonomic – we don't need two separate email accounts – securable, and sustainable. The Army Research Lab is doing my network defense. DISA inspects us, but I do not have time to clean up for an inspection I know is coming. I have to stay on top of it. I'm not willing to go through a cycle of ramp up, pass inspection, then relax and do it all over again. We've worked with Admiral Rogers before and know what his focus is, he's trying to keep a steady strain on the line. Finally, I have to be able to afford it. If I take on projects of my own, such as the SIS, I have to be able to sustain it. What we need to support the education mission is not generally supported by the enterprise so we try to find commercial off-the-shelf products rather than build our own, but even that takes work to ensure security.

Foundational needs: Communications closets need to be fixed, cable cleanup is needed – once we get that cleaned up we'll have a basic solid closet but with no room for SIPR. I have no idea when the classrooms were last updated. We are two versions of SharePoint behind and in the process of building the current version but we need a sustainable budget. The Learning Center will combine the training we already do with the writing program, but that's not exactly transformational. Then there's records management – the government has taken an interest in how records are stored and accessed.

Gen Newton: I'm going to hold you right there for some discussion. I see no need to talk about transformation if we are still dealing with foundational. How can we provide help – you've been screaming loudly for a long time. I want to dig into this, we've got to do something so the next time we have a meeting we can really see something.

CAPT Fraser: We've had this conversation over and over; this is not new. Yesterday we were talking about industry fellows, it's almost an embarrassment with our outdated IT if we get fellows from these leading edge industries. What can we do, other than find a magic bag of money? We've heard this conversation too many times. Do we need to go bang on the Chairman's door individually?

MajGen Padilla: This is a foot stomper that I recommend be included in your letter to the Chairman. The issue paper we've been asked to provide, which we've been told will be received favorably, if it can include this. The average student we'll get in 2020 will have grown up with digital and will be expecting better technology. We don't want them to be woefully disappointed.

Mr Doan: I think there's a narrative that needs to change – the missing link is you're 15 years behind the enemy, not 20 years behind the private sector. This is an education issue, not an IT issue. You're failing to prepare leaders for the threat they are going to face.

Ms Fulton: It's also a readiness issue. Either the Chairman buys the NDU value proposition or he doesn't. These are things core to your fulfilling your mission. You've got to update to prepare your students to accomplish their mission.

Gen Newton: What I'm interested in is, what is needed, and what are the next 3-5 steps you need resources to take care of to get us moving? That helps explain what I need to ask the Chairman and the Department to do.

RDML Webber: This slide is a picture of the investment needed. Some of what we need is the time to do what we need to do in. Cybersecurity is a big time and money sink for me. I am not a dot-mil, but I'm trying to meet dot-mil security standards. In a no-notice inspection environment, I have to say no to a lot of stuff that I'd like to do. Get DISA and the Joint Staff to understand that dot-edu needs support from the dot-mil enterprise that does not involve bludgeoning us. On my travels I see some intriguing ways of securing things that DoD won't let me do. If you can't do different things in an educational environment you're sunk. I don't know how we ramp up wargaming. The way DODIN [Department of Defense Information Network] secures its networks does not support a transformational institution. Having to meet dot-mil standards is hard.

VADM Breckenridge: Have none of the other military education institutions cracked this nut?

RDML Webber: DoD does not develop the tools we need to provide education and conduct assessment. There are a lot of tools we use that are not FedRAMP [Federal Risk and Authorization Management Program] certified, don't have a Certificate of Networthiness. It's a paper chase to certify the tools I need.

Ms Fulton: Does that mean that the other dot-edu domains haven't solved this problem?

RDML Webber: The services have a means of letting their schools off. They have a different structure than we do.

RADM Hamby: One of Diane's earlier comments about not being an AO is a problem.

VADM Breckenridge: Would it help if the Board said something about being an AO?

Gen Newton: Do you have a list of what you need? We need to get to the point where we have things fixed so we can provide an education to these leaders. In addition to getting things fixed, I need a list of what are the things we want to get to where we need to be.

RDML Webber: I have a shopping list and I think have done a good job of selling it to the Joint Staff. The colleges are constantly changing where they're going and growing. I'm now talking about a return on investment to get where we need to be. Transformation will take time and money and leeway, and not having to constantly spell out where I'm going and what I'm doing. I am working with my fellow CIOs.

Mr Solomon: What are the infrastructure limitations and the policy requirements that are getting in the way?

CAPT Fraser: Is this part of the budget or on top? Where are we relative to understanding how many dollars it will take to stay sustainable and eliminate the peaks and valleys?

RDML Webber: I have an upfront and a sustainable cost for everything I do, and I can show that. We have settled it at a steady state, and there is no such thing as a steady state in IT. To answer Ian's question, the cybersecurity piece is causing me to chase a lot of staff work. As our relation with the Joint Staff grows closer, and they do all their business on the high side for which we do not have the

footprint – maybe 26 or 27 NIPR [Non-secure Internet Protocol Router] boxes on campus – it's a multimillion dollar process to get the University up to that. I don't have a dollar figure for a NIPR to SIPR transformation. I'm just trying to get us to a SIPR level where we can support education. We can't do basic contract stuff.

ADM Walsh: I'm struck by the trends of your academic and business structures. Closets and classrooms is mission-critical.

RDML Webber: IT is the biggest pile of money in the budget. Infrastructure is mission critical. Academic stuff, like the SIS, Blackboard, the learning management systems that we use to teach. The FY20 bump-up represents NIPR improvement – I don't own NIPR/SIPR on the DC campus. I can provide a shopping list and money requirements, and it's a big bill. On the policy side, I've watched too many other schools try to survive on dot-edu, and it isn't working. We're talking about beginning to work with DISA outside the Military Education Coordinating Council to build what we need that can interface with dot-mil. Right now everyone is doing their own thing. We have compliance issues with every single thing on the list. There are some things I can't have on the net because it has something from China in it.

RADM Hamby: It's not just Diane's problem. I absolutely support the consortium idea.

VADM Breckenridge: It seems to me we could do some of the underlying work here, starting with the student side and what you need to provide there. The consortium is a great idea, but we can't wait for it. We can help build the business case, get them above the weeds to agree on a strategy and the outcomes. We need to focus on providing students the tools they need to be successful.

Ms Fulton: I don't know how you can have a strategy focused on winning the next ten to twenty years without innovation at NDU now.

CAPT Fraser: How much does this jeopardize upcoming accreditation?

RDML Webber: Classrooms come up every PAJE and every Middle States.

ADM Walsh: We're seeing here the impact and consequences of the warfighters' idea of IT – a background issue. If you're ready to make this kind of commitment to NDU, show us. You must invest in the infrastructure I need to make sure the students coming through are learning what they came here to do. We need a story.

Gen Newton: Thinking about how you communicate this, look for a different term than "we're different" – it sends the wrong signal to the people across the river. This is mission critical. The whole world is changing around us.

RADM Hamby: We can point to the organizations we are like that have unique needs.

RDML Webber: If I could be under an umbrella with like institutions, we can say we belong here.

CAPT Fraser: We're not unique from a cultural standpoint. Every educational institution is fighting this battle. It has to be an ongoing thing.

RDML Webber: There has to be a perpetual investment in IT

Gen Newton: Thank you, this has been very helpful.

ADM Walsh: Do you know if the Chairman has an advisory group on cybersecurity?

RADM Hamby: They very well might have a formal working group but I don't know for sure.

0915-0945: Cyber Curriculum Review, Rear Admiral Hamby

RADM Hamby: We took a look at the cyber curriculum across the University, not looking to tell the colleges what or how to teach but to look for the commonalities. We know we need to be a resource for the rest of the University, a functional lead in cyber. We walked through their programs with the rest of the colleges to see where cyber fits in their curricula. The chart shows there is cyber in every one of their courses, plus opportunities for electives. We also wanted to identify where our leaders and experts are. We have some resources here, and we're using those to build out a rolodex. The process involved self-reporting from the colleges and focus groups.

So here's where we are now. We're trying to use this data to develop a reference curriculum that any of the colleges could use. We've succeeded in getting some of the other schools to use this as well. There's an Army War College report suggesting that cyber be a fundamental requirement for any JPME certification. In our own curriculum, we're developing an elective course with the Eisenhower School that captures both our lens and their lens.

On content review, we're working with faculty and working to avoid stovepipes. We're building out information across the MECC [Military Education Coordination Council] about conferences that will be useful, to vet those that do add value for their faculty and staff. There is collaboration on research opportunities as well, and we do have folks who dig in.

We're moving into stakeholder evaluation of the reference curriculum, and to institutionalize the roles, responsibilities and processes. It took some time to get past the notion that this was a power move on the part of the University, but cyber is so important that there is no way my faculty can provide it all.

Questions?

Mr Doan: Are you ahead or behind your civilian counterparts on cyber issues?

RADM Hamby: It depends. If you are looking at how cyber is used as a weapon, we are way ahead. If you're looking at the policy, we are on a par or ahead. On public-private partnerships, we are ahead. On social media, we are behind. If you are making strategy, you must understand what the private experience is on the battlefield.

ADM Walsh: So is there an operational element that is critical for the pay grade that is coming through here? How do you have a cogent package? You have a disconnect between what you want to teach and what you can teach.

RADM Hamby: You are absolutely right. We can go out to elements like Raytheon to plug some gaps, but it's damage control.

Gen Newton: Yesterday, we said this is a prime opportunity for you to take ownership of defining what cyber ought to be. Comments from my colleagues?

Mr Solomon: Look at the modern warfighter view of cyber, its strategic importance.

CAPT Fraser: It also allows you to differentiate yourself as students are looking for the right place. You don't want to get into an echo chamber but rather that, collectively, we are better at this.

Mr Doan: I would urge you to eat your own cooking on this. There's an article in the current *Joint Force Quarterly* in which your own guys are telling you what you need to do. It's time to put a sense of urgency behind this.

RADM Hamby: That is a paper that one of our students wrote for his ISRP [Individual Strategic Research Project]. Some of our other initiatives – we are targeting student research where thought leadership is needed, and working in concert with INSS [Institute for National Strategic Studies] where thought leadership is needed. We have faculty participating under a State and OSD policy that gets straw-man proposals out there for other countries to react to; we are working with NATO and with US CYBERCOM to develop scenarios that commanders should think about. Our intent is that the legitimacy of this college will go through the roof.

ADM Walsh: Be careful not to be too successful. Watch out for shortfalls from the inability to create the learning environment. You can't let Diane's investment get too far away from the story.

Gen Newton: What relationship do you have with the services on the events they sponsor, such as the Air Force's cyber week?

RADM Hamby: We try to get faculty out, though I don't think we have anyone going to the Air Force cyber week. I didn't know when it was. We do have engagement with all the services' cyber components but it is focused on the competencies they want.

0945-1015: Faculty and Staff Command Climate Survey Results and Analysis, Dr. B.J. Miller, NDU Director of Institutional Research, Planning and Assessment

Dr Miller: Good morning. I'm here to share the results of the climate survey. I'll describe the survey, compare the results with those from last year, and look at our action plan.

The survey's purpose is to collect employee perceptions of the NDU climate. Last year, we revised the instrument significantly to incorporate some items on sexual harassment required by the DoD directive. Because of the revision, we have only two years of data for a longitudinal analysis. We've provided the survey as a handout for you. We discussed the option of outsourcing – to increase response, get some comparative data – but ultimately decided to keep it in-house for cost reasons. The survey ran from mid-March to early April, and we held a series of brown-bags to publicize and explain the survey. We had a very good response rate, 69%.

Looking at the results, the demographics and affiliation of respondents are representative of the NDU population. Functionally, faculty are a bit overrepresented.

In the longitudinal analysis, we have a four-year trend for response rate but only a two-year trend for climate factors. There was a significant improvement in the response rate, building on the improvement rate from 2014 which had only a 35% response rate. I am not aware of a comparative for response rate, but I'd say that 69% is pretty good. All five of the climate factors were higher than in previous years, and a couple were significantly higher. For all climate factors, the trends improved, but morale remained the same.

I'll focus on two of the open-ended comments – what should NDU sustain and what should it improve. So for example, 14% of the respondents cited meeting the mission as something NDU should sustain. Administrative support and transparency, communication, IT support were all cited as things needing improvement.

CAPT Fraser: Why is the IT support factor not a higher number?

MajGen Padilla: They were comparing it to what it was like earlier. They're seeing some improvement. It reflects the level of support and infrastructure and technical upgrades they're seeing now.

Dr Miller: Yes, there is recognition of improved support. To let you know how we disseminated the results, we gave briefings to the senior leaders and we will distribute the results on the SharePoint portal. We'll also provide presentations to components on request.

MajGen Padilla: I found the comments really informative. There is a lot of low hanging fruit out there that we can correct fairly easily. As I look at the consistent themes, there is a certain sentiment of the fatigue that comes of doing more with less. I attribute morale not going up to that. Resources are not in line with mission requirements.

CAPT Fraser: This speaks well of the leadership. You're not allowed to leave. This is the best news we've had this morning.

Mr Solomon: Are there any interesting observations if you look at the data by units?

MajGen Padilla: There are. Where you sit in the University makes a difference to your response. That's why I do eight town hall meetings, so I can speak to the components individually. We're going to do the same thing again, so we can address not only the overall metrics but those of that component, and close some misperceptions. It's all about communicating what decisions are being made and why. We need to make sure people understand the *why* behind the decisions.

Gen Newton: Okay. Thanks very much.

1015-1030: Planning Process for Strategic Plan AY 2018-2019 to AY 2023-2024, Dr. Yaeger and Major General Kane

Dr Yaeger: I want to talk about the strategic plan. The development is almost as important as the plan itself and I'd like the Board of Visitors input. Here are the six guiding principles, developed three plans ago. There was lively discussion about the order they should be in so we ended up with alphabetical order.

What I like about the current one is we have four main efforts and goals – too many more and you can't keep the plan alive. My direct reports are measured on how they contribute to the plan. The big difference between the current and the older mission statement is the inclusion of rigorous scholarship. The executive council of the University is the steering committee for this, so we start with them. We ask them for the goals, and hope there won't be too many. For each goal, we form a committee with representation from across the University, including students where appropriate, to develop strategies and metrics. This is where Board of Visitors members can help – once we define a goal, we hope you'll have some input by the November meeting. We want to have a final plan in place by our next spring meeting.

ADM Walsh: You have an opportunity to think about what we learned yesterday and today, you need something that pulls the institution forward. I'm looking for the word "future." You are trying to

anticipate the future needs of America.

CAPT Fraser: I'm amazed and amused that there was an argument about the goals. I see them as interdependent. They are all equally important. Fixing IT is easily documentable. My only warning is don't stop the train to work on the strategic plan and then just put it on the credenza and get back to work. This has to be a living document.

Ms Fulton: Do you need to have enablers as a standalone goal, or are they part of achieving the other goals?

Dr Yaeger: This goes back to when someone asked about accreditation. We got hit on lack of planning and resourcing for IT, because we were doing it on end-of-year planning and end-of-year money, so we felt we needed to have it as a strategic goal.

Ms Fulton: I still feel University improvement may need that.

Dr Logan: When I look at that list, I would like you to actionalize those – what I want every individual to do to demonstrate these values.

Mr Solomon: The greatest value of strategic plans is they help you make choices.

Dr Yaeger: This plan and the mission statement did certainly help us do that. We may not have been serving the best interests.

CAPT Fraser: Strategic plans fail because no one is rewarded for following through with them.

Dr Yaeger: That is why we put them in the performance system.

Gen Newton: A strategic plan should be updated every single year. It helps drive what we are doing this year. With the speed at which things change, it would be helpful. Does everyone in the organization understand the strategic plan and how they are involved in implementing it.

ADM Walsh: Have each leader account on the calendar how they are implementing and supporting the plan. You have a living report card on how you are accounting for your time.

Dr Yaeger: That's why the process is important, to codify what is important.

CAPT Fraser: Everyone in the organization can look at how what he is doing applies to the plan, and if it does not, why are we doing it.

Gen Newton: I know you are not just letting it drop, but it would be helpful to look at it more frequently. For example, again, IT, you can see whether you need to change the way you're doing things.

1030-1045: Break

1045-1145: BOV Member Feedback, Board Members

Gen Newton: We're ready to get started again. I'd like to change the program a bit. As you see, the J7, Admiral Scott, is with us, so I'd like to invite Admiral Scott to make some comments and then we can get some feedback. We've had some productive and excellent discussions. The floor is yours.

ADM Scott: Thanks to everybody for inviting me here. I would say that without a doubt the Chairman had given me strict guidance not only for University support but to go after the details we need to get back on track. The Joint Staff took control of the University budget last year, which I saw as a win-win with the added value of the Chairman's voice. The fiscal and personnel issues were a focus. My view of things now is, the guidance for the headquarters cuts was misguided and misapplied to the school. We are closely tied to the J8 mapping out the fiscal roadmap, and the Joint Staff will absorb the FY18 cuts. Next year, I'm driving us to be at 10% of the 45 or so people cut. We are going to frame the engagement with CAPE [Office of Cost Assessment and Program Evaluation] so I'm confident that will happen. You've identified some of the issues you have to address to bring the school up to speed, IT as an example. The vehicle we use for that is the POM process. We are working with Diane and the President to bring that up. Over the next two years I want to look at the prioritization across the J7 to bring that up. I'm willing to put that at the top of my prioritization list for the J7 so I am confident we will get there. We have been pretty successful the last few years in getting the issues we want addressed.

Gen Newton: This morning's IT presentation really laid it front and center. It's sad for us that as a result of what's happened in the past we don't have the basics in IT. I feel compelled to say that in our correspondence with the Chairman.

ADM Scott: I encourage you all to do that. There's no disputing the things we need. I hope to help you shape that dialog. This has to last beyond my name tag. This has shifted now to the Joint Staff so there is no longer pushing between institutions. We have the plan, we just need the resources to execute. As you know, there is a time lag between when the issue paper is presented and the resources happen, so my plan is to make the J7 the buffer for that. I want to institutionally tie this capability to the long term. This is not just a fix, this is an institutional line.

VADM Breckenridge: There are some cultural issues within DoD at large. Is there an area where we can help in putting some of them center stage?

ADM Scott: We had planned to have a series of engagements with Hill staff to broaden their understanding, which was pushed to the right due to a number of things. The Military Education Coordinating Council deals with military education institutional issues. A key component is missing, in my opinion, from the dynamic of the MECC so we propose a senior forum that deals with talent management and operations to go after cross-department issues. I envision it as a governance body to go holistically after all these issues, not just at NDU, as leverage across all the services. I have the support of the three-stars. Your understanding of that panel will be insightful.

CAPT Fraser: I appreciate the scalability of going across the services.

Mr Doan: The country owes credit to General Padilla for putting the University on solid ground. The organization is a coiled spring, ready to inspire students. My guess is there's Colin Powells in the classrooms now, and it's time to inspire them.

ADM Scott: The reality of how things get done in this town needs to be understood, and you need to be good at it. The other thing is, there are equally great successes at the O4 and O5 level, not just the ones who go on to flag and general officers. You can't have two camps, budget and rah-rah; they have to be the same. I want to relieve this staff who are at the leading edge of this institution of the admin burden. Aligning this under the Chairman and having the J7 take the lead is good. But we've got to be seen.

ADM Walsh: To follow up on the mechanics, I think we need a very strong message on the record. We need a discussion to define and drive the goal that concerns cyber, cyber policy and the cyber curriculum – that's how to get at the IT issues.

ADM Scott: The initial levers will be our issue paper.

CAPT Fraser: I would expect your audience to be more receptive of the cyber part than they have been. Take advantage of that.

ADM Scott: I think the Joint Staff is right in the middle of that. There is a balance, as cyber is growing, our development of that needs further discussion. But we couldn't be in a better position to drive that issue.

Gen Newton: Any comments from the colleges? How to define cyber is a tough question. If there is ever an institution that can define this issue, it would be this one.

ADM Scott: This is a plane that is already flying and we are trying to build it. There is a ton of activity across the services. I think in terms of alignment and focus. This is a real-world topic that we discuss in our tank and that the operating forces are dealing with. It's really about the alignment of the services, about who is doing what. All of this is real time.

ADM Walsh: So how would you architect the distinctions between dot-edu and dot-mil? It's hard to understand how you don't have the benefits of dot-mil but you have all the requirements.

ADM Scott: It's not a simple choice. You start by mapping the requirements. We have to understand the pros and cons but we have not made that decision. It may not be a one or a zero. Our question is can we have one pipe, can we have a system that is a hybrid. The optimal would be some type of hybrid. This is not an NDU-only issue. The money will be there, I'm pretty sure of that. And the magic here that wins the day at the Pentagon and on the Hill is what does this educational stuff mean to the development of the future force, and to our allies that participate in these institutions? My engagements and relationships with the folks at NDU – they've been doing a lot of great work. We just need to make it easier for them, and for their voices to be heard. Our team is solid, there are just some things we have to do over the long term.

Gen Newton: Thanks for taking the time to share those thoughts and vision with us. It helps us better understand our role. Please thank the Chairman for all his help.

1145-1200: Wrap-up and Closing Remarks, General Newton and Major General Padilla

Gen Newton: Do we have any final comments? Anyone in the back of the room have any thoughts?

Tim Robertson: I'm Tim Robertson, Director of Human Resources. We don't think it was ever Congress' intent to consider NDU as management headquarters. Please have something in your letter about that. There is nothing in the directive that says we are a management headquarters, we are a university.

MajGen Padilla: I'm really grateful that Admiral Scott came over here. I want to publicly thank you all for what you do. Sometimes it's a vector check but sometimes it's a course correction, and you have provided a view that helps us. We are working hard to stay on the minds of our stakeholders and that they understand our value proposition.

Things you have championed for us with the Chairman have made a big difference to us, and I want to thank you for that.

I am fortunate to have been part of the NDU team. It's a tremendous team. It's a question now of making it easier. I'm starting to see some light at the end of the tunnel, and I don't think it's a train.

Gen Newton: Let me say we very much appreciate your leadership and that of the vice president. I'll finish up, with reference to the staff, especially those working behind the scenes, you're doing an excellent job.

COL Cabrey: This formally closes the open session of the board meeting.

Appendix A: National Defense University
Board of Visitors Attendance Roster
July 11-12-2017

1. Vice Admiral Jody A. Breckenridge, USCG (Ret)

2. Mr. Douglas C. Doan

3. Captain John H. Fraser, USN, (Ret)

4. Ms. Brenda Sue Fulton

5. Dr. Suzanne Logan

6. General Lloyd W. Newton, USAF (Ret)

7. Mr. Ian H. Solomon

8. Dr. Stephen J. Trachtenberg

9. Admiral Patrick Walsh, Ph.D., U.S. Navy (Ret)

National Defense University
Board of Visitors Meeting
July 11-12, 2017
AGENDA

Military: Class A Uniform
Civilian: Business Suit

Tuesday, 11 July 2017
Room 155A/B, Marshall Hall

1300	**Call to Order**	Colonel Richard Cabrey, USA (Retired), Designated Federal Officer
1300-1315	Administrative Notes (DFO comments/overview of agenda)	Colonel (Ret) Cabrey; General Lloyd "Fig" Newton, USAF (Retired), BOV Chair
1315-1345	Video and State of the University Address	Major General Frederick M. Padilla NDU President
1345-1430	State of the NDU Budget	Major General Robert Kane, USAF (Retired), Chief Operating Officer; Mr. Jay Helming, Chief Financial Officer
1430-1500	Review of the Process for the Accreditation of Joint Education (PAJE) Visits for NDU Programs	Dr. John Yaeger, NDU Provost
1500-1515	**BREAK**	
1515-1615	College Value Propositions	Rear Admiral Janice Hamby, USN (Ret), Chancellor, College of Information and Cyberspace; Colonel Ann Knabe, Dean of Students, College of International Security Affairs; Rear Admiral Jeffrey Ruth, Commandant, Joint Forces Staff College; Brigadier General Chad Manske, Commandant, National War College; Brigadier General Paul Fredenburgh III, Commandant, The Eisenhower School
1615-1630	Industry Fellows Recruitment Strategy	Brigadier General Fredenburgh III

1630-1645	Day One Wrap Up	General Newton and Major General Padilla
1645	**Meeting Ends for the Day**	**Colonel (Ret) Cabrey**

Wednesday, 12 July 2017
Room 155A/B, Marshall Hall

0830	**Call to Order**	Colonel (Ret) Cabrey
0830-0915	Information Technology/Academic Technology Migration Progress Update	Rear Admiral Diane Webber, USN (Retired), Chief Information Officer
0915-0945	Cyber Curriculum Review	Rear Admiral Hamby
0945-1015	Faculty and Staff Command Climate Survey Results and Analysis	Dr. B.J. Miller, NDU Director of Institutional Research, Planning and Assessment
1015-1030	Planning Process for Strategic Plan AY 2018-2019 to AY 2023-2024	Dr. Yaeger and Major General Kane
1030-1045	**BREAK**	
1045-1145	BOV Member Feedback	Board Members
1145-1200	Wrap-up and Closing Remarks	General Newton and Major General Padilla

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE
NATIONAL DEFENSE UNIVERSITY
WASHINGTON DC 20319-5066

Dear Board of Visitors,

Thank you for the support that you continue give to NDU. I am appreciate the guidance you provide the University and would like to provide you with a written copy of my State of the University Address as delivered 11 July 2017:

First, I would like to recognize several new members who have joined the Board, in alphabetical order: Vice Admiral Jody Breckenridge (US Coast Guard, retired; former Pacific Area Commander), Ms. Sue Fulton (the first female academy graduate to chair the US Military Academy's Board of Visitors), Dr. Suzanne Logan (a member of the Senior Executive Service serving in the Office of Personnel Management), Mr. Ian Solomon (a former official at the University of Chicago and Yale Law School, and a former advisor to the US Treasury Secretary), and Admiral Patrick Walsh (US Navy, retired; former Vice Chief of Naval Operations and Commander, US Pacific Fleet). I look forward to your thoughts and advice as each of you have such diverse expertise to bring to the Board of Visitors and NDU.

I can report that NDU continues to be the preeminent institution for educating joint warfighters and other national security leaders, and we continue to transform our institution to provide the best possible student experience. Each of the leaders of our component colleges will share with you their value proposition later today. Since the last Board of Visitors meeting, we have new senior leaders join our team, we have improved our curriculum, we have realigned to best support the mission, and we have successfully completed another academic school year. I would like to provide you with a picture of what we have recently accomplished and what lies ahead for the University.

Organizational Updates

Since our last meeting, six new leaders have joined our team, including two Deans of Faculty and Academic Programs: Dr. Amie Lonas for Joint Forces Staff College and Dr. Mark Troutman for the Eisenhower School. We also have four new Deans of Administration: Mr. John "Jay" Kennedy for Joint Forces Staff College, Mr. Mike Cabrey for the College of International Security Affairs, Ms. Catherine Reese for the Institute for National Strategic Studies, and Mr. Mike Peznola for the National War College.

Auditing the meeting today is the incoming Commandant of National War College, Brigadier General Chad Manske, US Air Force, who will take over at the National War College later this week. Brigadier General Darren Hartford retired last month from the US Air Force after over 28 years of service; we wish him God speed in his future endeavors.

We were recently informed that Brigadier General Paul Fredenburgh was selected by Admiral Harris of US Pacific Command to be his J-6. While a surprise to NDU, this is great news for BG Fredenburgh and speaks to the caliber of talent we have at the University. We are working with the Joint Staff to quickly find a replacement for him.

In addition, two of our senior leaders are detailed to the National Security Council: Dr. Mike Bell of the College of International Security Affairs and Dr. Rich Hooker of the Institute for National Strategic Studies. We are very fortunate to have Dr. Chuck Cushman serving as the Interim Chancellor of the College of International Security Affairs and Dr. Laura Junor serving as the Interim Director of the Institute for National Strategic Studies.

Finally, the Secretary of Defense announced on 27 Jun 2017, that the President has nominated Navy Rear Admiral Frederick J. "Fritz" Roegge, for appointment to the rank of Vice Admiral, and for assignment as President, National Defense University. RADM Roegge is currently serving as Commander, Submarine Force, US Pacific Fleet. We wish RADM Roegge good luck with the confirmation process and will inform the Board as we get future updates. I want to thank you for your recommendations and counsel throughout the years, as these efforts have facilitated the elevation of the NDU President's position back to a three-star billet.

In addition to our leadership changes, we have changed and codified the organizational structure of the University to more closely mirror a civilian university. This reorganization is based on the Board of Visitors' recommendations in 2013 and on recommendations from our accrediting bodies. While it has taken some time, we have functionally aligned university activities under two Vice Presidents: the Vice President for Academic Affairs, or Provost, and the Vice President for Administration, or Chief Operating Officer. Both of these positions report directly to the NDU President to ensure a nested approach toward the University's vision and mission. Examples of this are the Commandants, Chancellors, and Directors are aligned under the Provost to focus on academics and engagement, while the Deans of Administration are aligned under the Chief Operating Officer to focus on running the University's business enterprise. Functionally aligning the University better delineates roles and responsibilities of the different parts of the organization and will enhance our efforts to improve cooperation across NDU. The updated organizational structure will better prepare NDU as we begin our annual Talent Management process.

As mentioned at our last meeting, we are adding a final phase to this third iteration of the Talent Management Review process, in which component leaders share their talent management results and best practices with each other, both for accountability and to improve the NDU workforce holistically. We will also discuss military service members and interagency members along with Title 10 employees (federal employees on appointments, or civilian academic faculty) and Title 5 employees (Government Service employees, or civilian staff members) as we continue to move the process to a more complete review of all of NDU's workforce.

Mission Update

This past June, NDU celebrated the graduation of its 40th Top-Level School class, consisting of 747 students, including 103 International Fellows from 64 countries. In total, NDU's enrollment was over 2,000 students and includes all full year academic courses, short courses, certification courses, and dispersed-learning education courses. NDU's Class of 2018 will begin the academic year in August.

Joint Forces Staff College is conducting our Joint Professional Military Education II program in residence in Norfolk, with a satellite program currently being conducted in the National Capital Region, actually meeting here in Marshall Hall as we speak. Joint Forces Staff College's Joint Combined Warfighting School delivered the 10-week course, in satellite format, at each Combatant Command headquarters on a rotating basis. As with most NDU Joint Professional Military Education courses, going beyond the standard seminar size and balanced joint configuration actually decreases individual participation and starts to skew discussions from a joint/interagency perspective to more of a single military service perspective. This iteration in the National Capital Region was in such great demand that we had to limit additional students to protect the rigorous standards required for the program.

The CAPSTONE course is currently underway in Lincoln Hall. This class consists of 41 one-star military officers from the US military services, seven members from Interagency partners, and four military officers from allied nations.

We also have the new class of 68 International Fellows from over 54 countries on campus preparing to begin studies at the Eisenhower School and the National War College in August. They are currently on their first American Studies trip in Montana. Additionally, 38 fellows arrived last week from 26 countries to participate in the College of International Security Affairs' International Counterterrorism Fellowship Program.

The International Student Management Office has improved upon its American Studies elective, including its field practicum, for our National War College and Eisenhower School International Fellows. This program exposes international students to unique perspectives on American society and proves to be a tremendous bonding experience that reinforces the International Student Management Office's mission to cultivate future international security assistance cooperation. We completed a pilot elective with four US students this past academic year, with great praise by the US students who participated in the program, by the college faculty who supported the elective, and by the international students who got to know our US students better. Expanding the program with more US students will greatly benefit both international and US students from the exchange of perspectives and deepening of relationships. Challenges we continue to face are deconflicting the elective requirements with core courses and paying for the US students, as they cannot be covered by the same funding source as the International Fellows.

As reported at the last meeting, we have continued to improve our core curriculum with only minor adjustments to the timing of our electives. The newly renamed College of Information and Cyberspace, formerly the Information Resources Management College, conducted the second iteration of its Joint Professional Military Education II Master's program, graduating 15 students. The Provost, Dr. John Yaeger, will provide a more in-depth look into our curriculum later today.

Within the last eighteen months, the Process for Accreditation of Joint Education (PAJE) team visited all five of our schools. This military accreditation evaluation mirrors a civilian educational accreditation process. NDU is also accredited by the civilian Middle States Commission on Higher Education in order to grant master's degrees. NDU received a renewed

accreditation from this Commission in November 2013. The Provost and the college deans will provide updates on their PAJE efforts and results later today as well.

A major highlight for NDU this year was the National Hall of Fame Induction Ceremony held during graduation week. After a break over the past few years, we inducted six distinguished US alumni into our Hall of Fame: Senator John McCain; Generals Eric Shinseki, Martin Dempsey, Ann Dunwoody, and Janet Wolfenbarger; and Secretary of Homeland Security John Kelly, who was inducted a few weeks earlier. We plan to induct Secretary of Defense James Mattis, and Generals Hugh Shelton and Anthony Zinni when their schedules permit. We intend to continue holding an annual NDU National Hall of Fame Induction Ceremony during future graduation weeks.

Fiscal Environment

While I have some recent optimism regarding the fiscal situation of the University, I remain concerned until our funding has actually been restored. We have been fighting Department of Defense-wide management headquarters reductions that were levied on NDU. A management headquarters is a headquarters element for a staff like a combatant command, a military service, or the Joint Staff. The Chairman and Vice Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff have agreed that NDU is not a management headquarters. The Director for Joint Force Development, J-7, VADM Kevin Scott, has been working with his counterpart director in the J-8 and the Director of the Joint Staff to exempt NDU from these cuts in order to prevent the current 32% reduction in NDU's budget since 2013 from growing to a 36% reduction.

If all goes as planned, the University will not be subject to a $12.4M budget reduction over the Fiscal Years 2018-2022 budgets, also known as the Future Years Defense Plan, and only 12% of the billets currently identified as management headquarters-like will be identified as management headquarters billets. We will monitor this situation closely until all of the appropriate actions are completed.

Additionally, NDU has been asked to submit a special budget request, also known as an issue paper, to the Joint Staff to secure additional funding to invest in our information technology, academic technology, and facilities. Major projects include updating our information technology infrastructure, improving wargaming capabilities and experiential learning, constructing and resourcing NDU's Learning Center, and enhancing our existing facilities. Our goal is to resource the University in a way that is aligned with our mission requirements.

Operational Challenges

I addressed the implementation of a University Student Management System at previous BOV meetings. While we have made advances, our current system is only an interim solution. A major issue is our inability to store personally identifiable information. We are currently looking at ways to create a long-term solution that meets the needs of the University. Our Chief Information Officer, Rear Admiral Diane Webber (US Navy, retired), will address this issue, as well as our information and academic technology issues more in-depth tomorrow. I remain

committed to improving our University Student Management System, which includes a smooth transition from our interim solution to a long-term solution.

Special Initiatives

We have started developing in earnest NDU's Learning Center by assigning and realigning staff positions under the Center. Additionally, our facilities staff has started the design process for the Learning Center.

Since our last Board meeting, we have been asked to assist with developing a National Security Decision Making Course for senior civilian employees new to the federal government. While this J-7 initiative was envisioned to cover employees from presidential appointees to the senior GS level of multiple federal departments, it will most likely start with a pilot of Department of Defense civilians, potentially with 20% general and flag officers joining the cohort. This will not be an NDU course, but NDU will help facilitate it with subject matter expertise and classroom space. The initiative will eventually be owned by the Office of the Secretary of Defense, with the Office of the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff as a potential partner. We do not have dates yet for the pilot course, but anticipate it running later this year as more presidential appointees are confirmed.

Command Climate

Command Climate remains one of my top priorities and I have positive news from our latest survey. Our response rate was almost 70%, a big jump from previous survey responses. While we must always look to improve our work environment, we continue to see our command climate trending in a positive direction. Dr. B.J. Miller, our Director of Institutional Research, will provide a more detailed update from our Command Climate Survey tomorrow.

How the Board Can Help NDU

I would like to ask for your continued support of National Defense University and that you continue to serve as advocates for NDU during your external engagements. I stand by my previous statement that if NDU looks the same in 2023 as it does today, we will have missed an opportunity to improve our national security and run the risk of this institution losing relevance. We seek your insights and creative thoughts for ways to improve the University, and we appreciate the input and wisdom from all Board of Visitors members as we work together to strengthen our organization.

Thank you for taking the time out of your busy schedules to support NDU and to provide advice to the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. Your diverse expertise and perspectives are needed now, more than ever, as we continue our important work.

As this will most likely be my last Board of Visitors meeting as NDU's President, I would like to personally thank the Board for your counsel and your advocacy throughout my time at NDU. There has been no place else in my 35 years as a Marine where I have been

exposed to such a distinguished and candid advisory board, and I have greatly benefited from this experience. Thank you again.

Subject to your questions or comments, we can continue the agenda.

F. M. PADILLA
Major General, USMC
15th President