For Joseph:

We’re speaking to you today because…

The purpose of the [Faculty Advisory] Council shall be to advise the President, the Provost, and the Board of Visitors on matters affecting the academic welfare of the University and to ensure effective faculty participation in the governance of the University as a whole.

Our concern is that the proposal before you would inadvertently undercut a principal tenant of NDU’s 2017 organizational realignment—the obligation to “preserve each academic program’s uniquely valuable heritage, culture, and student educational experience.” We further believe that the proposed change seems likely to weaken NDU by weakening its components’ ability to stay connected to relevant stakeholders by lessening the amount of manpower dedicated to this crucial mission. Administratively, it also seems likely ~~in practice~~ to disadvantage some programs in favor of others.

For James:

Admiral Walsh, Board Members, Admiral Roegge, and other distinguished leaders, thank you for the opportunity to speak.

We note the Memo has three top-line objectives but does not detail either underlying problems or expected benefits/opportunities. Those merit further discussion

* The Memo offers a single strawman solution to meet its three objectives. NDU-P proposes to add two new lines of responsibility to the Commandants’ portfolios: another College (CIC and CISA, respectively) and unspecified additional duties at NDU. As a consequence, CIC and CISA will lose their civilian Chancellors and the two Commandants will each wear three hats
* The Memo does not explain why a new structure – with tri-hatted commandants and no Chancellors – is the best way to achieve the desired objectives
  + We have not seen alternative COAs
    - We recommended that NDU-P fully develop alternative CoAs to see what other options might best meet the objectives
    - The C2 issues under consideration are not urgent and deserve full consideration
  + The Memo lists potential problems, as detailed by the FAC and by others, but does not respond to those criticisms. While an absence of dialogue doesn’t mean that remediations are not in work, the void does not build confidence in the plan
* The Memo assures the NDU community that this proposal is not intended to subordinate one college to another nor to merge or eliminate colleges or programs.
  + That said, some fear that the Memo is a Trojan Horse for further integration of university components at the expense of each component’s distinctiveness
    - Some aspects of administrative and operational mergers already seem to be in play within the NDU hiring priorities process
    - Components can be weakened without disestablishing them. Proposed changes to JFSC earlier this year highlighted this point
  + Fear is furthered by actions that seem to commoditize the Title 10 civilian faculty and have hurt their morale. NDU…
    - Reduced three year re-appointments to two-year re-appointments
    - Decided to leave key College leadership billets unfilled—the leaders who faculty feel best represent them to a sometimes indifferent NDU
    - Started hiring more junior faculty, but then increased the impediments to promotion, and further devised an up-or-out promotion system for employees who are already term-limited

**Some have fear and many lack confidence in the plan**. The Memo does not define success, nor does it show any consideration about what failure might look like. The failure to define failure is a critical defect, especially since *changes of this magnitude cannot be easily reversed and failure could take years to undo*. That imposes significant risk on NDU that will play out well after current leadership has any ability to remediate

**We need to pick the right leadership model for cultural change**. Organizational culture is not mentioned in the Memo, but it is a significant factor in achieving the better NDU of the future. Recently, NDU’s top four leaders considered what the ideal culture for NDU should look like in 2024, while directing the components to measure their existing culture. All used the same competing values framework. Results were that

* CIC’s and CISA’s cultures are most like the desired NDU culture
* The colleges with Commandants are least like the desired culture with more hierarchy and less adhocracy than desired

The character of this proposed change—imposing a hierarchical military leadership model onto all NDU colleges—is at odds with NDU-P’s intent to bias NDU’s culture in favor of flexibility and discretion over stability and control.

**Bad timing**. Though we have enduring concerns, we think that this proposal will divert attention from more pressing issues at a particularly bad time for the leadership team.

* NDU is facing a series of crises with regard to its physical plant (Eisenhower’s evacuation, Roosevelt’s decay, and Marshall’s deterioration). Significant and enduring problems exist with the NDU budget, NDU’s HR program, and NDU’s IT systems.
* These are all within the COO's area of responsibility and we assume he will exhaust all of his bandwidth addressing these areas.
* At the same time the Provost is leaving his position in the very near future, perhaps leaving NDU without an established, long-term academic leader. Finding the right Provost for NDU may prove difficult—ask anyone who remembers the brief, turbulent tenure of Dean Yaeger’s predecessor
* NWC's commandant will not be on-board until mid-October at the earliest
* NDU-P will be here for some measure of continuity, but his term expires in a year

**What we recommend**

* *To provide the necessary leadership for CIC and CISA, fund and fill the CIC and CISA Chancellor billets*, which have been purposefully gapped for more than a year
* *To provide better connectivity with the Joint Warfighter, seek to strengthen links with Joint Staff, CCMD, Service and OSD counterparts* in areas relevant to the strengths of each academic program
* *Pursue future strategic initiatives from the bottom up rather than imposing them from top down*
  + Especially important in academic areas, such as curriculum
  + There is demonstrated evidence that Faculty can, from the bottom-up, build successful, sustainable, relevant programs. CIC’s Cyber and Information curriculum is one recent example.
  + Include, from the very beginning, faculty and staff and allow them to influence policy development rather than to comment on finished drafts. Talent management circa 2014-2016 is an example of success
  + Developing a sense of long-term ownership among faculty and staff is essential for enduring success and durable organizational change
  + Trust can’t be surged and meaningful, productive ownership can’t be imposed. We must build these in, not duct tape them on
* We would welcome as a legacy accomplishment for NDU-P, a fully-funded, robustly equipped and wholly manned NDU that has facilities that conform to the level of excellence all of us aspire to. That achievement would best help NDU meet the nation’s National Security needs in a world characterized by friction between great powers and increasingly unfriendly to the interests of the United States, its friends, and allies.