

**REPORT OF
THE NATIONAL DEFENSE UNIVERSITY
BOARD OF VISITORS MEETING**

Held on August 5, 2019



A public meeting was held on August 5, 2019 by the National Defense University Board of Visitors in Lincoln Hall, Room 1107, Fort McNair, Washington DC, 20319

Date of this Report: September 25, 2019

Patrick Walsh

**Patrick Walsh, Admiral, USN (Ret.)
Chair**



**National Defense
University Board
of Visitors Meeting
August 5th, 2019
MINUTES**



The National Defense University Board of Visitors (NDU/BOV) met at Fort Lesley J. McNair in Washington, DC 5 August 2019. The attendance roster and agenda are attached in Appendix F and G.

Monday, 5 August 2019

1000: Call to Order

Dr. Brian Shaw, Designated Federal Officer

Dr. Shaw: Thank you all. I have some prepared statements that I am required to make under the Federal Advisory Committee Act. I appreciate all the time and effort that went into today. This is also student arrival day at NDU.

Good morning. I am Brian Shaw, Deputy Provost for Academic Affairs and the Designated Federal Officer for the National Defense University Board of Visitors. I would like to welcome everyone to today's NDU BOV meeting. This meeting is open to the public until 1200 this afternoon, Monday, 5 August, 2019. This is an out-of-cycle meeting called for the specific purpose of addressing a single issue. The University appreciates the time and responsiveness of our Board members in arranging their schedules to attend and preparing for this meeting and for their forthcoming deliberations. I and the Board also wish to thank my NDU colleagues for all their efforts in preparing for this meeting, providing support and arranging the venue in the midst of our student check-in day. We appreciate everyone's consideration given the large university community present today.

As the Designated Federal Officer, I serve as a liaison between the Board and the Agency. I am also responsible for ensuring all provisions of the Federal Advisory Committee Act are met regarding the operations of the BOV. Also, in my role as Designated Federal Officer for the Board, a critical responsibility is to work with appropriate Agency officials to ensure that all appropriate ethics regulations are satisfied. In that capacity, Board members have been briefed on the provisions of the Federal Conflict of Interest Laws. In addition, each BOV participant has filed a standard government financial disclosure report. I, along with Legal Counsel for NDU have reviewed these reports to ensure all ethics requirements are met.

NDU'S Board of Visitors is chartered under the authority of the Secretary of Defense and required by Department of Education regulations. This requirement is to provide "independent advice and recommendations on the overall management and governance of NDU in achieving its mission" and to provide for "the safeguarding of freedom of inquiry." NDU's senior leaders are present to present significant issues, answer questions or to clarify information as well as to listen to the board's deliberations.

We have a full agenda and as you will note, agenda times are approximate. So, be advised that

we may not be able to keep to the exact times as noted, however, we strive to ensure adequate time for the University's presentations, public comments and Board's through deliberations.

Copies of all meeting materials and public comments both oral and written are, or will be available at <https://www.ndu.edu/About/Board-of-Visitors/> .

As required by FACA, time has been specifically allocated for questions from the public. We scheduled a public comment period from 1130-1200 offering the public (including the NDU faculty and staff) the opportunity to provide comments about the topic being considered before the Board today. Members of the public, faculty and staff are encouraged to either make a presentation or provide written comments to the Board.

We currently have four scheduled comments and also have been provided written comments. For any public commenters that have not preregistered, please notify either myself or another member of the NDU staff if you are interested in making a comment or addressing the Board so that we may provide adequate time for your comments.

In addition, public commenters may be asked to provide clarification of their comments to assist the Board in their review. As per FACA, minutes of this meeting will be prepared. The minutes will include a description of the matters discussed and any conclusions reached by the Board.

As DFO, I prepare the minutes and ensure they are certified by the meeting Chair within 90 calendar days of this meeting. The minutes of today's meeting will be available via the NDU web site. In addition to the minutes, there will be a NDU BOV Meeting Report to the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

The Board will prepare this report as a response to questions posed by the University. This report will include their review and analysis of materials presented and any advice or recommendations of the BOV.

The Fall meeting is tentatively scheduled be held here, Ft. Lesley J. McNair the week of October 29-31. A notice of the exact locations, dates and times will be issued prior to the meeting in the Federal Register.

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

1000-1005: Administrative Notes

Dr. Shaw, Admiral Patrick Walsh, USN (Retired) BOV Chair

Thank you Dr. Shaw, thank you NDU community, faculty and staff for your presence and participation today. I think we have on the line we have South campus represented and Mr. Ian Solomon. I'm going to turn the meeting over to the NDU President and have you give us an opportunity to understand the vision that's before the board. I look forward to hearing the commentary from the audience and those who wish to participate.

1005-1100: NDU Leadership Roles and Responsibilities

VADM Frederick J. Roegge, NDU President

Thank you ADM Walsh. Thank the BOV for their time for this out of cycle meeting. I always seek your advice and take full advantage of your views. This meeting is on a key issue of roles and responsibilities and a potential change. First a few broad updates. The mold issue in Ike hall

appears to be accelerating with impact on life, safety and health. Recently two employees have needed medical attention so I am moving up the timeline to relocate faculty, staff and students. This is being moved up from previous scheduled this winter but needs to be moved up. This will require flexibility in moving up 4 months to safeguard health and safety of our people. I'd like to thank our team for flexibility and patience. Also since May we graduated the class of 2019 and tomorrow convenes class of 2020. [He discussed some recent personnel changes with Chancellors and Dr. Yaeger's stepping down to pursue other interests].

ADM Walsh (Retired): Thank you to Provost Yaeger for your commitment to this mission of the university. We will entertain comments based on the remarks of NDU-P.

AMB Myrick (Retired): I appreciate your remarks and your vision and innovation to make what NDU does better. A fundamental conceptual question that I have involves my understanding that you're trying to more effectively blend the benefits of military education with the effectiveness of strategic military operations, which means that we have to understand what each part of this equation brings. I am curious to know your concept of the difference between these two leadership proposals. I recognize that they have to be blended, but how do you see military education developing as an essential element as compared to the strategic military outcomes that we are committed to achieve?

VADM Roegge: Let me give it a shot, and I'm open to the views of everyone on this side of the room also. I think that the value in this concept would be having a general or flag officer returning from an operational command leadership assignment provide operational relevance and currency in ways that can help us to provide strategic direction on how curriculum can or should or needs to be refreshed or updated, which is what the Joint Force requires. Of course the joint force in this context is probably too narrow. I appreciate we have partners who are foreign government, interagency participants, industry partners, etc. The opportunity for the commandant to provide what the joint warfighter requires is part of a mix of meeting those educational outcomes required by all of our stakeholders.

Ms. Fulton: I have a series of questions. One in the area of due diligence that has been done so far, the second in the performance of each college, and third the unique roles of each college. I'll start with stakeholders. Have you gotten feedback from any of the COCOMs on this plan?

VADM Roegge: No, the plan is to deliberate this internally first. This is pre-decisional.

Ms. Fulton: Have you gotten any feedback from the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff?

VADM Roegge: No, I am still competing for time to get that opportunity.

Ms. Fulton: My understanding is that in terms of accreditation, CIC [College of Information and Cyberspace] got a six year accreditation?

Dr. Yaeger: NDU is accredited by Middle States as a university, each JPME [Joint Professional Military Education] program is accredited by the J7 through the OPMEP [Officer Professional Military Education Policy]. Across the board, we're green everywhere. Everyone is at six years and the university is fully accredited.

Ms. Fulton: I hear you saying you're not subordinating any college, but you're putting CIC under someone. You're dual-hatting the Eisenhower Commandant and the Dean would report to that person, and the same for NWC [National War College] and CISA [College of International Security Affairs]. I don't see how that doesn't qualify as subordination. Presumably this person

would be in a command role, able to make decisions and have authority. I would love to see survey results by college. If this action proceeds, we have to understand each college's past performance and how faculty and students perceive it. What is at risk if people perceive dual-hatting as subordination? We may risk a further exodus of intellectual capital.

ADM Walsh (Retired): It would be useful I think to describe the organizational changes ahead, a baseline.

Dr. Logan: Before you start that, I heard something Sue said and I appreciate her perspective very much. What I was hearing was a concern about the quality of learning: we are all concerned about that, which is part of why you've undertaken this. More than that, what I've understood from my readings and heard to this point, is that this is an organizational restructure, and not anything that should have an impact on the quality of the curriculum being taught and the outcomes of the students. I need some clarification on that.

VADM Roegge: Most simply, this is about taking a leader that we already have, or in this case two, and giving them additional responsibility. With the responsibility to enable and facilitate that college – all of their programs are delivering what is required and helping us to better anticipate where the curriculum needs to go in the future.

VADM Breckenridge (Retired): I think you're trying to affect means through existing staff. If we look at cyber as an example, where we have a curriculum that is trying to build experts returning to the field in a very rapidly changing environment. At the same time we need to do a better job of looking across the system strategically, asking what all of our graduates need in the way of cyber. Are we too stove-piped, does this help us get at the tactical and strategic levels better?

Dr. Yaeger: The mission statement has changed and in there is a reference to globally integrated operations. The big challenge is integration. A big part we have to work on across the university is to have students that are familiar with all domains. We're good with land, sea, air, but now we need space, information, and how they are integrated. I'm sure our sister institutions have the same challenge.

We haven't been accredited under this mission statement, it's new. The biggest weakness in our curriculum today is integration, which we need to take on.

AMB Myrick (Retired): Perhaps a new approach with coordination between COCOMs [Combatant Commands] and J7 could address this.

Dr. Yaeger: It's absolutely true we must ensure we are delivering what our stakeholders need in communication with the COCOMs.

Ms. Fulton: I agree, it's critical that all our students understand the needs of cyber warfare. However, Congress determined we were not meeting the needs of the force. And they created this opportunity to have folks who are experts – which means there are choices about where we utilize our non-infinite resources. Do we use them to build general understanding or strategic experts in cyber warfare? It seems to me Congress has expressed an intent. If we can make the case we're not subordinating those colleges (I'm still not convinced), it raises a serious question. We should strive to do both, but we have to make choices where those resources will go. Will the Commandants have the ability to reassign faculty between colleges?

VADM Roegge: Some of the work left to be done is that level of detail with those

responsibilities and C2 [Command and Control] relationships. My original concept had changes to C2 and reporting relationships, but based on feedback, I am no longer convinced I have the right answer. Much work is left to be done to put a finer point on things.

Based on DOD feedback, the next level of survey would be COCOMs and Congress. Alumni are also keenly interested in things that go on here. That is a strength. What I tried to highlight in the paper is that the biggest opportunity I want to seize is to use the dual-hatted Commandant, specifically for insight and perspective that comes across programs, which helps us with vertical and temporal integration. I see them as being less needed and less involved in day to day operations and curriculum. I have very talented Deans who are hired in order to do that. I see the nature of their responsibilities and bandwidth shifting in these more strategic directions. It is the responsibility of all NDU leadership for us to determine the learning outcomes but the determination on how to deliver those and how to design the curriculum is the Deans', and that's what we're attempting to reinforce.

VADM Breckenridge (Retired): No matter what we do, the messaging is really important. Reading the paper, I saw a great challenge and a great opportunity. I think having one of the Commandants left in their traditional role and adding another school in is problematic. Both from an external perception and what you're trying to convey. They have a full-up job right now. It creates a conflict as to their priorities. If you want them thinking strategically, you should create a temporary position. We should follow the SES [Senior Executive Service] model.

I think the opportunity is huge. Cyber is a very fast paced environment, but most of the challenges and solutions are in the private sector. This is an opportunity for us to get engaged in this arena, which will flow back into the Eisenhower School. There are some tremendous benefits in this plan, but we need to be careful in the messaging.

AMB Myrick (Retired): I hope we are not conveying the notion that our critical strategic thinking and cultivation of that thinking is limited to military.

VADM Roegge: It is the strategic direction I expect to come through the university and down through the commandants, but the curriculum and outcomes are under the direction of our civilian academics, the Deans.

I take your point, Jody, about not just what we do but when and how we do it. One of the details I would expect to come out of this university-level working group proposed in the paper is a strategy about timing and transition. Our next Commandant of the war college is due to report in October. If we are in a position to execute that proposal before that time, the new Commandant of the [National] War College, we could bring him in as Commandant of the [National] War College and CISA (College of International Security Affairs). It may be that in implementation that some phased approach is appropriate to address the reality of what we intend but also to address the concerns and perceptions.

I am keenly aware of the concerns that have been shared. It is clear to me that over many years there are many things that contribute to a sense of suspicion or concern or mistrust. I will continue to work every day to address those concerns. I am not naïve in considering that those concerns will remain if we go down this proposed path and through its execution.

I fully appreciate the value that comes from the deep expertise we have in our faculty, Dean, and acting Chancellor. There is nothing in my proposal that diminishes or reduces that capability. In fact, part of what I would look for in recommendations, if we are considering operationalization

and implementation, is not just the phasing we might do, but what kind of person we are looking for. We do have subject matter experts serving in uniform who can mitigate some of those risks being identified as they are both warfighters and experts with industry partners and career experience.

VADM Breckenridge (Retired): It's an opportunity to expand. It's tough in some of these fields to keep up with what's really happening – there's an opportunity to bring a broader perspective that our warfighters don't have in their day to day experiences. Industry can help the warfighter develop a broader horizon in an increasingly complex environment they must operate in. We have to identify opportunities to make sure they are better prepared.

ADM Walsh (Retired): We are commenting on individual tactical moves, when we have an undefined sense of how we operationalize this. We have outcomes that the Chairman has given us. Building on what the Provost has raised here, how do you integrate those? You have the opportunity now to be the mirror image of what the Chairman's talking about.

How are you going to leverage the civilian component to this? Because I think it's too narrow to talk about Chancellors and schools. Cyber breaks down all the old rules that are simply no longer relevant. I would like to crowdsource some of the challenges here. You have people teaching this stuff who, if giving a chance to design operational structure, may come up with something very far afield from what we've been teaching in professional military education.

Dr. Logan: Yes, we have focused quickly on what might happen to two or four people, but what about the outcomes? Is there something even bigger than what you have thought about that would transform the educational experience of all the participants who come here? I'm not saying I'm against this, putting cyber with Eisenhower. But what about the cyber that needs to go to the War College students and across the curriculum? Is this something even more dramatic, but also more future-focused, as the new mission statement is leading to, that might actually open up the curriculum to absolutely everyone who attends?

ADM Walsh (Retired): It's probably more dramatic than what we imagined. The provost has a critical role – you have to project ahead in a way that is going to challenge the whole organizing principles on which the university presents itself. That poses an interesting accreditation challenge as well. The approach we have to take is academically and fiscally informed for a sustainable approach.

VADM Breckenridge (Retired): These questions are trying to understand what happens after this analysis. I don't think you hear anything in disagreement to the strategic end state and the goal you're trying to accomplish. We've received a tactical proposal and we are reacting by trying to think more broadly. It's pushing the boundaries – have we been bold enough to look beyond what the Chairman has required?

ADM Walsh (Retired): We leverage skills and talents in different ways and that needs to be represented in the structure of the university.

AMB Myrick (Retired): I think we need the views of the new Chairman.

VADM Roegge: Absolutely, that's why I'm requesting that time. You recall the theme of our previous meeting was the NDU strategy and the approach of answering key questions. We are trying to challenge ourselves to ask: What do all our graduates need to know? Yes there is a college element, but there is something more that every graduate needs. A graduate of NDU – it doesn't matter which program they graduated from. They've completed JPME II and they're

going to a JDAL [Joint Duty Assignment List] billet, and because the system is not good at recognizing individual experiences, every graduate needs to meet certain common elements that are a requirement of the joint force.

What we're looking at now is an operational and tactical view of C2, but it's designed to enable this discussion. I see this proposal as a way of integrating what is the best of each college that all of our graduates benefit from. We're using cyber as a stalking horse in this discussion – if there's something that today's 21st century national security strategist from NWC needs to know about, it's the operational space of cyber domains. Probably something more than what they're getting right now. These irregular warfare threats have not gone away and PME institutions must make sure every graduate has knowledge in this area. I see this proposed reorganization as an opportunity to meet what the joint force needs.

Dr. Yaeger: Each college has a unique mission and we're going to preserve that, but there are a couple areas that we've identified. On leadership and ethics, we've come up with a pilot program that Eisenhower school is going to deliver this year, a three-week course at the beginning of the academic year. The other course we're still developing is really about the changing character of war and it's being led by a professor at JFSC. The other area we need to focus on is what students have to read and do before they get here. Compared to other institutions we don't ask for much. About half of our students are PME I students. We've talked about cyber and disruptive technology and all of our students need to know how to manage those risks.

Ms. Fulton: The top new priorities the new chairman has, one of them is information warfare. I imagine he's going to have very strong opinions on both how we train every student and specifically what CIC needs to deliver. There's a general sense within the military that there is something that every war college graduate should come back to the force with. I worry that if we get too deep into that we risk homogenization and we lose what sets NDU apart. What is it that makes NDU distinct? The ability to deliver folks who have unique strategic abilities and thinking. I want to be sure we are clear about any trade-offs we might be making.

It's clear that this proposal has generated some very strong reaction within the staff and faculty and here we are in an ad hoc meeting, we do have a sense of urgency that we need to dig into this. You have some coincidental departures – we want to make sure that we are helping with due diligence on this.

Mr. Solomon: Thanks very much. I apologize to my colleagues on the board for my inability to be there today. My profound thanks to Dr. Yaeger for all of his service. I appreciate the opportunity to have this conversation on a strawman proposal. I see real value in improving integration horizontally and vertically, and the ability to look out into the future.

To me, this proposal needs to pass three tests: What is the best way to ensure research and teaching excellence? Any model we adopt, is it improving our ability to attract and retain that talent or is it inhibiting it? Second, how are we soliciting perspectives beyond the military? Is there anything inhibiting our ability to get those perspectives? Third, the character of war and defense is changing, is a change helping us to be more or less innovative? My own sense is that these recommendations from the staff advisory council for a planning team, and suggestions about using the survey instruments they've used in the past, are all things you might think about.

1100-1130: Public Comments

Dr. Shaw: Looks like this is a good time to open up for public comments and discussion. We

have four people who have requested time to address the board. If there is anyone else here or in Norfolk, please let us know so I can allocate time. Five minutes per presentation please, and then the board can ask questions or provide feedback. At this time I'd like to recognize Joshua Baughman, Chairman of the Staff Advisory Council.

Mr. Baughman: [Written Comments] See Appendix A

ADM Walsh (Retired): In terms of what you've heard this morning in our discussion, do you think we're moving in the right direction?

Mr. Baughman: Yes, but there's a lot of things to take into consideration. We have this opportunity to really change and be the best NDU can be. Really understanding what the problems are, a formal analysis of the problem, and identifying multiple alternatives, are needed.

Dr. Shaw: Thank you very much. Next, Dr. Carl Horn, Director of Strategic Studies in CIC.

Dr. Horn: I had a lot of remarks but scratched them while listening to the BOV discussion. NDU-P has presented something which he thinks is the right way to go. Unfortunately I have concerns about how this process was done. We teach our students not to do a strawman, we teach planning. I don't think we have enough data to justify a change. Our programs at CIC and CISA have been led by civilians successfully. Our programs have been looked at closely and we are meeting what is being looked for. We did all this with civilian leadership. It doesn't have to be military. Military leadership, because they're rotational, provide a key piece of currency to the curriculum. However many areas, as the BOV says—cyber, irregular warfare etc.—need to be done by someone who wasn't brought up with traditional military background. As we continue to go forward, looking at specific leader skills will help, but I don't think military is the solution.

ADM Walsh (Retired): I find it interesting that the president's goal here is to have leaders who are operationally current. An intriguing part of cyber is the realization that the people who are on the front line in this fight are in the private sector, and the people who can get in and survive, but not know what happened, are those in government. It's an interesting role reversal. I am interested in how those who are part of the program you described would structure leadership roles. How would you build into the organizational DNA requirements that are not just personality based but part of the university? I really agree with what was described here earlier that what distinguishes this university is currency and proficiency—by being in this area and community, you get something no one else gets. I think if we can bring in the discipline that you described in the subject matter you're familiar with into the organizational DNA that would be relevant. We have to be aware of what's going on in the private sector if we really want to be impactful.

Dr. Horn: All programs here meet the JPME II requirements common standards. That's the common thread. Where each of the components are different are their areas of specializations. There's currently an effort right now to review the guiding document— all components have had the opportunity to contribute. The discussion here about what every graduate needs to have— well it should be about the OPMEP, as long as we're meeting that requirement, it'd be good for the institutions to go ahead and diversify their curriculum. Our college does provide cyber and information electives, open to all students to take, along with those special interests from the chairman which have been mandated. That addresses the space domain, information environment, cyber and integrated operations. The faculty here are very dynamic and engaged. Sometimes I get concerned that the only way leaders think we can get integration is with the

military. I get concerned when leadership directs us and tells us how we should do things. Faculty here are self-starters and they are required to retain their proficiency. I don't see a lot of third floor presence in the classrooms. I think if the Chairman did that, he would realize it's a very dynamic and aggressive environment where students are challenged day to day.

ADM Walsh (Retired): I'm taken by your comments, they're very compelling and persuasive. You opened with concern about process. I will tell you that this is an inherently clumsy process. I think that we're here and having this discussion in public is the process you need.

Dr. Horn: I disagree, I think we should have given you more information and analysis with various courses of action to analyze. This conversation started mid-June and there were conversations about implementing in August. I heard today about October. It's a very aggressive timeline. There are so many things (hiring process) that need to be considered. NDU is not good at this. We make decisions and we figure it out later. I would like, just once, to have a thoughtful process and thoughtful execution that happens before we started, not after.

VADM Breckenridge (Retired): Can I go back to NDU-P. In looking at your proposal, dual-hatting is not a permanent solution, but a first step to determine what appropriate leadership should look like in the long term.

VADM Roegge: Actually no, I am proposing this as the next step in our evolution. I absolutely think that at this point, what the university would most benefit from is giving the Commandants additional responsibilities over academic programs.

Ms. Fulton: Did you inform faculty and staff that you planned to implement this year?

VADM Roegge: What I have always tried to enunciate since we began this process is there are some seminal events on our academic calendar, and if we have the opportunity we should try and align ourselves to those. I am trying to be deliberative as well as transparent and collaborative. It takes as long as it takes. If we were in a perfect world, we would have done this the day after graduation. The next seminal event is convocation. The next opportunity might be when a new leader comes in, a fresh start. The next opportunity is the change of semester this winter. I have never tried to say that we must reach a decision to meet any one of those suspenses. But all of those are potential logical markers that we could align ourselves to.

Ms. Fulton: Yes, perhaps there was a miscommunication as I've heard you wanted this implemented in August. That's unfortunate.

Dr. Horn: Both CISA and CIC have a DOD mission set. In CIC, we have JPME programs, but that's just one piece. We have a responsibility to the DOD CIO. CISA has a responsibility to the OSD. When we ask someone to come in and take this on, they're taking on a lot more than two "war colleges." We are held to the Secretary of Defense mission set.

Dr. Shaw: Thank you very much. Dr. Joseph Schaefer, Chair of the Faculty Advisory Council.

Dr. Schaefer: I stand here as the elected representative of our faculty and the chair of the faculty advisory council. I would like to add my thanks to Dr. Yaeger and Dr. Cushman that I've received for the thoughtful counsel I've received over the years. Foremost, we share our nation's goal to educate strategic leaders. We sign our contracts every other year as part of our commitment to staying current. If we do not remain current, we do not remain here.

Dr. Churbuck: The memo you have before you is a simple strawman. It doesn't say why this approach is the best way. We have not seen alternative COAs [courses of action]. We look

forward to seeing alternatives and analysis. The lack of verbal discussion does not lend confidence to the plan. Some fear that the memo integrates institutions at the expense of institutional uniqueness.

[Remainder in Written Comments] See Appendix B

CAPT Zirkle: [Written Comments] See Appendix C

1130-1200: Board Member Deliberations

Mr. Solomon: Based on what I heard, I am very much aligned with the members sitting around the table, although perhaps more strongly moved by hearing comments from people I can't see. NDU is not much more than the quality of staff and people that we can hold together; it is critical that they be a part of the process. The urgency is not as imminent as I initially thought. I am relieved there is no impending deadline. Perhaps we still have time to lay out a process that is transparent. I feel even more strongly about the process point after hearing the feedback from others in the crowd.

Ms. Fulton: I would sincerely like to express my thanks to all those who made comments. They were all thoughtful, made good points, and were done in good faith, and I'm grateful. As a next step, I want to hear feedback from the COCOMs and the new Chairman. Specifically to see if they have clear feedback on what needs to improve, or more to the point, what problem we are solving. We need to be very specific on that. It would be incredibly helpful to hear stakeholder feedback and how you've processed that and what you're thinking at our next meeting. That's where my thinking is now.

Dr. Logan: Thanks to all who spoke. It's always helpful to hear more and get perspectives. I did hear an undercurrent earlier that a statement of the vision, just very direct where we want to be beyond just saying the mission statement, but what is it that we feel we need to focus on, would be helpful for everyone to understand. The clearer the vision, the easier it is to understand and adopt it. We would be happy to be a sounding board on that, and as we continue to discuss, we may be able to focus on that better. I think we have gleaned, just by the conversation, that clarity will make a big difference. Beyond the clarity, I'll use the word timeline, but timelines are hard in these situations when you're trying to make significant change. If you could develop some sort of a flow that describes the way we need to go forward, so that we do have the right perspectives at the appropriate time. And demonstrating how that loop closes and how that information comes back in. It's one of the hardest things any of us do as leaders to make change. An organization that's not growing and changing is dying. Growing and changing is critical, always. This is a painful moment but it may end up being an enlightening moment. One that does exactly what we believe that ensures this institution is the leader among our peers.

VADM Breckenridge (Retired): I echo the sentiments from earlier. A couple contextual comments: while DOD has been creating the requirements – when they come, they're done as a standalone. They don't consider what they're fitting into and they never come back for evaluation. This is an opportunity to take a fresh look. I do have a sense of urgency looking at this, because there are some fundamental things on horizontal and vertical alignment that we need to deal with very quickly. How much time is the Chairman really going to have to engage with us on these issues? Sometimes you have a one shot opportunity that you must use to set the stage. My proposal is that we step out on this. I don't believe in the dual-hatting at this point, I'll just say it. It's very difficult without having some bigger plan. One individual coming in will

have too much to learn about just the NWC and how it operates. I would rather have a different structure that brings in the perspectives we've discussed. I want a specific requirement for engagement with the private sector. That's where it all happens right now, in cyber and financial regulations alike. This is part of the solution set of the future.

AMB Myrick (Retired): I endorse this notion of the need for more thinking on this process. I commend VADM Roegge for his willingness to identify a new way and his innovation. If our goal is to facilitate the ability of the warfighter to continue to be successful, we have to do that in context. The warfighter's environment is changing and the threats are changing in ways we've never seen before. As most of you know, we are going through this national strategic process, using terms such as globally integrated operations, we're trying to determine what that means how we're going to do it. In light of all of that, NDU is uniquely positioned to lead a lot of this thinking. I commend you for approaching it in that kind of creative way. I'm not wedded to the notion of the changes you've proposed at this time however.

ADM Walsh (Retired): I'm really grateful for all remarks. Very interesting ideas and insights. I think we've called special attention to process and timeline in a way that can help you and your leadership team determine whether you've got it right. I went into this thinking about two Commandants and two Chancellors as equals. What I walked away with is a matrix. In my mind I've got international security affairs and cyberspace, structured horizontally across the Eisenhower School and National War College and South Campus, which operate vertically. You need a different organizational structure. This is the idea behind bringing in outside ideas and insight, we're not wedded to something that's traditionally done. We do have a view into the future you're trying to build a curriculum around and we've seen lots of different models.

Ms. Fulton: I have another concern and I'm not sure how to address it. We've had a long-time acting chancellor of CIC, and another departing acting chancellor of CISA. I feel like we've been hobbling these organizations. And now we're talking about another acting position while this is sorted out. It concerns me – we're able to get military replacements right away. Now I know that when we come here again, we'll have two actings while we consider this organizational change, and I don't know if that's healthy.

ADM Walsh (Retired): What also came out in listening was the need for resources, and the need to get to sustainable funding.

VADM Breckenridge (Retired): Admiral Roegge, have we helped you?

VADM Roegge: I benefit from the discussion. I asked for this meeting because I value your advice and perspective. My charter is to move the university forward in ways that are responsive to the needs of the joint warfighter. If there is going to be a BOV report, that would be helpful in consolidating and focusing the ideas we've heard.

I want to revisit what I think fundamentally is the biggest problem, which all of us have seen and need to get after. To highlight it, I'll share one other perspective that I've heard in listening mode: Is there a danger that a Commandant sitting across multiple programs could shift faculty from one to another? My answer is no, I don't see any danger in that, I see that as an opportunity. It would make the university more effective, if there was an excess of faculty in one place and a need in another that would help us use our resources more effectively.

The danger would be that we make no changes and yet somehow expect we can still achieve improvement across these three areas I've described. This is not a new idea but here we are

facing the same problems our predecessors have faced over the years. That's why I'm willing to challenge the thinking about the organizational process.

To respond to something stated by Dr. Horn: I am not passionate about this proposal. I do hear clearly the desire and recommendation from the board that we look more broadly than this one solution, and I'm good with that. It is not a setback for Roegge or the university. My perspective, well informed by all the feedback today, I specifically do want the ability to look across our program, in ways that we don't do well today. I'm not sure that adding another independent voice advocating for a single program or college is the best way to do that, but I appreciate the suggestion.

If you, like me, see the potential benefit of having this echelon of leadership with responsibilities across programs, it scopes down the number of potential solutions for us to take a look at. Understanding that logistic and operational deliberation may contribute. I thank you again for your time and advice and for your support.

AMB Myrick (Retired): Solely in the context of our discussion today, is there anything regarding JFSC that you have not mentioned?

VADM Roegge: In regards to JFSC, we are already doing this. The commandant at JFSC is dual-hatted and provides direct support to the Chairman of the J7 and NDU. General Irwin has demonstrated that he has the capacity and ability to provide some unique value, not only to the Chairman, but in enhancing and highlighting the value of the university.

Dr. Logan: JFSC is kind of a pilot study. I know it's not two colleges, but two policies that a single Commandant is responsible for. I think it would be useful to have discussions with the students and faculty about whether it worked for them. Perhaps this is not as foreign as I was first thinking.

VADM Breckenridge (Retired): In response to the question you asked us explicitly, I think the matrix solution Walsh described is a possibility. I do believe that what the Chairman described, the matrix concept of approaching the problem set we have, is where we want to get to.

ADM Walsh (Retired): Yes, don't restrict yourself to brick and mortar.

Dr. Shaw: There are several people I need to recognize: Elizabeth Christian and Jim Fleming for taking minutes of today's meeting. Thanks to Operations and the IT team for arranging the meeting logistics and setup. I formally close the meeting of the National Defense University Board of Visitors meeting.

Appendix A

Staff Advisory Council Public Comments

NDU-SAC 2 August 2019

MEMORANDUM FOR NDU BOARD OF VISTORS

Subject: Staff Advisory Council Feedback on Proposed Commandant Sharing Change

1. The National Defense University (NDU) Staff Advisory Council (SAC) appreciates the opportunity to provide feedback on proposals that affect NDU and its mission enablers. This memorandum reflects staff feedback solicited by Council leaders on the topic of the recently published Information Memo that proposes reallocation of the existing General Officer / Flag Officer (GOFO) Commandants of the Eisenhower School (ES) and National War College (NWC) to also become the Commandants of the College of Information and Cyberspace (CIC) and College of International Security Affairs (CISA) respectively, in a shared manner.

2. The SAC is concerned by this proposal for two main reasons; process and content.

a. There is a perception among NDU employees that the process of developing this proposal would have benefitted from increased openness, transparency, and collaboration. The lack of a formal and rigorous analysis of options to solve specific problems, as stated during the 8 July 2019 town hall, is troublesome and represents an opportunity for increased input from multiple viewpoints moving forward.

b. Staff feedback gathered by the SAC from across NDU echoes each element noted in the "Feedback: Concerns and Alternatives" section of the provided Information Memo. Leadership has cited the fiscal benefits of not filling existing billets, the desire to be unconstrained by the existing structure, and an aspiration to better leverage the rank of the Commandants, but the specific problems intended to be solved with this change remain unclear. Additional staff feedback highlights concerns about the message this change may send to the wider NDU community, joint force, lawmakers, alumni, American public, partners, and adversaries. Any decision that may be perceived as reducing the capability of the colleges addressing our nation's highest defense priorities risks being interpreted as inconsistent with published strategies, policies, and priorities. Focused and qualified leadership is important to each organization.

3. In light of the above, the NDU SAC recommends that a planning team (representing a cross-section of NDU perspectives) be formally established and resourced (including appropriate time) to develop suitable, acceptable, and feasible options that align with the NDU mission, vision, strategy, and ongoing efforts to improve the command climate. Concurrent to that effort, the NDU SAC recognizes that each NDU component has a unique and critical role in our national defense and expresses that each should be manned appropriately, with existing leadership and staff positions prioritized.

4. The contact for this document can be reached at joshua.d.baughman.civ@ndu.edu.

//---original signed---//

TRISHA E. BACHMAN
Secretary, NDU SAC

//---original signed---//

PATRICIA M. CLOUGH
Vice Chair, NDU SAC

//---original signed---//

JOSHUA D. BAUGHMAN
Chair, NDU SAC

Appendix B

Faculty Advisory Council Public Comments

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 adhocacy 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.

Appendix C

Written summary of public comments provided by Capt. Daryk Zirkle:

R/CAPT Z

It's important to consider all available courses of action, as it's absolutely critical the best one is selected. We are AT war, and have been for some time. Our adversaries have long histories of manipulating other countries' political processes, up to and including our own in the modern day. Their understanding of Great Power Competition goes well beyond armed conflict, and we have been slow to relearn this lesson in the 21st century. In the 1980s, we understood it well enough to watch the Soviet Union crumble without firing a shot, but we systematically dismantled the primary tools we used to achieve that result throughout the 1990s. We're finally starting to rebuild those tools, with Special Operations Command and the Global Engagement Center leading the charge. But we have to maintain that momentum, and not succumb to the seductive fiction that as long as we can win any shooting war, we "win". If our nation lacks the will to act, it doesn't matter how many F-35s, Abrams tanks, aircraft carriers, or submarines we have.

Without a focus on the broader aspects of Great Power Competition, we'll condemn ourselves to "short victorious war" that are neither.

Appendix D

Anonymous Comment for BOV Meeting:

Anonymous Comment for BOV Meeting

5 August 2019

Good afternoon, I would be remiss if I didn't take the opportunity of this meeting to mention that I am shocked and disheartened at the decision to replace our Provost, Dr. Yaeger. This announcement was appalling to many of us and has negatively affected morale. Well-respected across this University and at the Pentagon, Dr. Yaeger's distinctive blend of excellence in both his military and academic experience has positioned him to serve this University very well in such a fundamental leadership role. The University community has not been made aware of the reasons that informed this decision. The way this was executed, as well as the lack of understanding of the decision and what this might mean for NDU's future, has left at least this one member of the NDU team discouraged and uneasy. In the absence of context, speculation at NDU is running rampant. This is entirely unfair to a man who wholly embodies service with integrity and who has given his heart and soul to this University for decades. I believe Dr. Yaeger deserves better and I hope that this Board will not be shy in giving him the respect and appreciation that he has earned. Let us all hope that NDU is fortunate enough to hire another person of his caliber to serve as our next Provost.

Appendix E

Comment from Paul de Souza:

To the National Defense University (NDU) President and Board of Visitors (BoV),

As an American tax-payer actively supporting our national defense as leader of a global network of over 100,000 cybersecurity professionals, I appreciate the opportunity to provide input into the discussion under review during the 5 August 2019 BoV meeting at NDU.

I am very familiar with the NDU College of Information and Cyberspace (CIC) and its rich history of contributions to our national defense since its origin in the 1960s as the DoD Computer Institute (DoDCI), through its rebranding as the Information Resources Management College (IRMC) and then iCollege, and today as CIC. I actively support its unique role ensuring more senior Joint Warfighters understand the complexities of information and cyberspace challenges to our national defense.

As you may or may not understand the depth of, our nation is completely under-prepared for current and future conflicts with any reasonably capable nation due to our tremendous information and cyberspace related vulnerabilities, and our lack of personnel who truly understand the scope of the threat as well as potential solutions. In short, many military planners do not understand that we can no longer assume our ships, planes, or tanks make it to their desired locations or are able to function as intended.

A root problem of our under-preparedness in this respect is the lack of information and cyberspace understanding across the senior leadership of our defense community, and CIC is uniquely positioned to help solve this problem. That is why I strongly recommend against any decision that would reduce CIC capability, and encourage the development of other options that would solve NDU problems without reducing CIC capability in any way.

The leadership changes proposed clearly reduce CIC capability by removing the current CIC positions of full-time Chancellor (SES) and Deputy Chancellor (Ambassador) and replacing that dedicated leadership team with a full-time Dean and part-time Commandant (shared with the larger Eisenhower School). While the Chancellor and Deputy Chancellor have remained unfilled vacancies since summer of 2018, and a single Dean has been serving as acting Chancellor (and also covering the Deputy Chancellor function), that should not be seen as a sustainable approach for the long term.

Again, thank you for this opportunity and for your role in our nation's defense.

Regards,

--

Paul de Souza, CSFI-CWD (Cyber Warfare Division) Founder Director
Military Cyber Professionals Association (MCPA) Advisor
Adjunct Faculty, George Washington University
Board of Advisors at The Cyber Intelligence Initiative (CII) at The Institute of World Politics
INFOWARCON Advisor

Appendix F

National Defense University Board of Visitors Attendance Roster August 5, 2019

1. Vice Admiral Jody A. Breckenridge, USCG (Ret)
2. Ms. Brenda Sue Fulton
3. Dr. Suzanne Logan
4. Ambassador Bismarck Myrick (Ret)
5. Mr. Ian H. Solomon (by phone)
6. Admiral Patrick Walsh, Ph.D., U.S. Navy (Ret)

Appendix G



National Defense University Board of Visitors Meeting August 5, 2019 AGENDA

Military: Class A Uniform
Civilian: Business Suit

Monday, 5 August 2019

Room 1107, Lincoln Hall

1000	Call to Order	Dr. Brian Shaw, Designated Federal Officer
1000-1005	Administrative Notes <i>DFO comments/overview of agenda</i>	Dr. Shaw; Admiral Patrick Walsh, USN (Retired), BOV Chair
1005-1100	NDU Leadership Roles and Responsibilities	Vice Admiral Frederick J. Roegge, NDU President
1100-1130	Public Comment	Members of the NDU community or general public
1130-1200	Board Member Deliberations	Board Members
1200-1215	Wrap-up and Closing Remarks	Admiral Walsh and Vice Admiral Roegge
1215	MEETING ENDS FOR THE DAY	Dr. Shaw