[H.A.S.C. No. 111–184]

CONTINUED ENGAGEMENT: DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE RESPONSES TO THE HOUSE ARMED SERVICES COMMITTEE APRIL 2010 REPORT ON PROFESSIONAL MILITARY EDUCATION

HEARING

BEFORE THE

SUBCOMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND INVESTIGATIONS

OF THE

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

ONE HUNDRED ELEVENTH CONGRESS

SECOND SESSION

HEARING HELD
NOVEMBER 30, 2010

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

63–159 WASHINGTON : 2011

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office,
http://bookstore.gpo.gov. For more information, contact the GPO Customer Contact Center,
U.S. Government Printing Office. Phone 202–512–1800, or 866–512–1800 (toll-free). E-mail, gpo@custhelp.com.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND INVESTIGATIONS

VIC SNYDER, Arkansas, *Chairman*

JOHN SPRATT, South Carolina
SUSAN A. DAVIS, California
JIM COOPER, Tennessee
JOE SESTAK, Pennsylvania
GLENN NYE, Virginia
CHELLIE PINGREE, Maine
NIKI TSONGAS, Massachusetts

ROB WITTMAN, Virginia
WALTER B. JONES, North Carolina
MIKE ROGERS, Alabama
TRENT FRANKS, Arizona
CATHY MCMORRIS RODGERS, Washington
DOUG LAMBORN, Colorado
TODD RUSSELL PLATTS, Pennsylvania

LORRY FENNER, *Professional Staff Member*
THOMAS HAWLEY, *Professional Staff Member*
FAMID SINHA, *Staff Assistant*

CONTENTS

CHRONOLOGICAL LIST OF HEARINGS

2010

Page

HEARING:

Tuesday, November 30, 2010, Continued Engagement: Department of Defense Responses to the House Armed Services Committee April 2010 Report on Professional Military Education 1

APPENDIX:

Tuesday, November 30, 2010 29

TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 30, 2010

CONTINUED ENGAGEMENT: DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE RESPONSES TO THE HOUSE ARMED SERVICES COMMITTEE APRIL 2010 REPORT ON PROFESSIONAL MILITARY EDUCATION

STATEMENTS PRESENTED BY MEMBERS OF CONGRESS

Snyder, Hon. Vic, a Representative from Arkansas, Chairman, Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations 1

WITNESSES

Hebert, Lernes J., Acting Director, Officer and Enlisted Personnel Management, Office of the Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness 2

Hix, BG William C., USA, Director, Operational Plans and Joint Force Development, J–7, Joint Chiefs of Staff 3

Lutterloh, Scott, Director, Total Force Training and Education Division, U.S. Navy 6

MacFarland, BG Sean B., USA, Deputy Commandant, Command and General Staff College, U.S. Army 4

Neller, Maj. Gen. Robert, USMC, President, Marine Corps University 9

Sitterly, Daniel R., Director of Force Development, Deputy Chief of Staff, Manpower and Personnel, U.S. Air Force 7

APPENDIX

PREPARED STATEMENTS:

Hebert, Lernes J. 37

Hix, BG William C. 41

Lutterloh, Scott 59

MacFarland, BG Sean B. 46

Neller, Maj. Gen. Robert 68

Sitterly, Daniel R. 64

Snyder, Hon. Vic 33

Wittman, Hon. Rob, a Representative from Virginia, Ranking Member, Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations 35

Page

DOCUMENTS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD:

[There were no Documents submitted.]

WITNESS RESPONSES TO QUESTIONS ASKED DURING THE HEARING:

[There were no Questions submitted during the hearing.]

QUESTIONS SUBMITTED BY MEMBERS POST HEARING:

[There were no Questions submitted post hearing.]

CONTINUED ENGAGEMENT: DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE RESPONSES TO THE HOUSE ARMED SERVICES COMMITTEE APRIL 2010 REPORT ON PROFESSIONAL MILITARY EDUCATION

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
SUBCOMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND INVESTIGATIONS,
Washington, DC, Tuesday, November 30, 2010.

The subcommittee met, pursuant to call, at 9:07 a.m., in room 2212, Rayburn House Office Building, Hon. Vic Snyder (chairman of the subcommittee) presiding.

OPENING STATEMENT OF HON. VIC SNYDER, A REPRESENTATIVE FROM ARKANSAS, CHAIRMAN, SUBCOMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND INVESTIGATIONS

Dr. SNYDER. Good morning and welcome to the Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations' hearing on the views of the Secretary of Defense, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the uniform heads of services on the House Armed Services Committee report on professional military education. The title of our report was "Another Crossroads? Professional Military Education Two Decades After the Goldwater-Nichols Act and the Skelton Panel."

In April 2010, after more than a year of studies and hearings and site visits by both members and staff to all the relevant institutions, the subcommittee published this report with 39 findings and recommendations. The report examined officer in-residence PME [professional military education] as a critical investment in the most important element of our military—our people. We concluded that the United States cannot afford to be complacent when it comes to producing leaders capable of meeting significant challenges whether at the tactical, operational, or the strategic levels of warfare. Further, as a matter of national security, the country's continuing investment in the PME system must be wisely made.

We also found that although today's PME system is basically sound, there are areas that need improvement. The committee's report of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 required that the Department's most senior leaders provide their views on the subcommittee's PME report.

DOD [Department of Defense] leadership provided their views in September and indicated they largely agreed with our findings and recommendations. We are here today to hear what they agreed with, what they disagreed with and plans for moving forward, and also any thoughts about what our report and the ongoing discussions left out as our country moves forward on looking at professional military education.

We have a fairly large group of witnesses today. And you know how the reality is; if you all make an hour-long opening statement, I am not going anywhere, I don't have an office anymore, so this is fine with me to sit here, but you all may have better things to do. But we have your opening statements. They will be made a part of the record.

And I also want to acknowledge the presence of Representative Davis from California, who is the current chairperson, will be the ranking member in the new Congress, on Military Personnel [Subcommittee]. And as you know, this subcommittee does not have legislative jurisdiction, but the Military Personnel Subcommittee does. And she has had an ongoing interest and will be here in the new Congress.

So we are joined today by—is it Lernes?

Mr. HEBERT. Lernes.

Dr. SNYDER. Mr. Lernes Hebert, the acting Director, Officer and Enlisted Personnel Management, Office of the Deputy Under Secretary of Defense; Brigadier General William Hix, Director for Operational Plans and Joint Force Development, J7, Joint Chiefs of Staff; Brigadier General Sean MacFarland, Deputy Commandant, Command and General Staff College, U.S. Army; Mr. Scott Lutterloh, Director of Total Force Training and Education Division, U.S. Navy; Mr. Dan Sitterly, Director of Force Development, Deputy Chief of Staff, Manpower and Personnel, U.S. Air Force; Major General Robert Neller, President of the Marine Corps University, U.S. Marine Corps.

Thank you all for being here. Is this the order we are going to go down? We will begin with you. And we will put the clock on for 5 minutes. If you see the red light fire off, we are not going to set off flares or anything, but——

Mr. HEBERT. It won't take that long.

Dr. SNYDER. Okay. Good. Why don't you go ahead?

[The prepared statement of Dr. Snyder can be found in the Appendix on page 33.]

STATEMENT OF LERNES J. HEBERT, ACTING DIRECTOR, OFFICER AND ENLISTED PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT, OFFICE OF THE UNDER SECRETARY OF DEFENSE FOR PERSONNEL AND READINESS

Mr. HEBERT. Yes, sir. Chairman Snyder, members of the committee, on behalf of the Secretary of Defense and the Under Secretary of Defense of Personnel and Readiness, I want to extend our appreciation for the committee's interest in improving professional military education. The Department is in the process of analyzing the recommendations of the committee's report on this subject and reporting back to the Congress on the proposed changes to the Department's policies and procedures. We take this task very seriously. We are using a senior-level review panel to properly evaluate each recommendation; and while I will not presuppose their deliberations, the Department's initial review indicates broad support for almost all of the recommendations and with the exception of a few that we believe require further study.

That being said, the Department has already taken action on some of the recommendations. For example, in fiscal year 2009, we

asked the Director of the Joint Staff to review JPME I [Joint Professional Military Education Phase I] instructor positions to see if the positions could qualify for joint duty credit. This report has been reviewed by the Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel Readiness and forwarded to the House Armed Services Committee. In addition, the Department proposed a legislative change to remove the JPME I instructor prohibition specified in Title 10, which specifically addresses a recommendation in the report. This places these positions on equal footing with similar positions across the Department.

The Department also agrees with the committee findings that the professional military education system is sound but could use some improvements to become more flexible and attuned to emerging requirements. The Congress aided this effort immeasurably by passing legislation in 2007, the National Defense Authorization Act, allowing the Department to move beyond the recognition of simple interservice operations and to recognize interagency and international experiences.

This single change, along with the flexibility provided to adapt career-long joint qualifications, is the type of proactive engagement described by the committee's report. Officers are now being recognized for significant joint experiences in Iraq and Afghanistan and other temporary operations not initially described in the charter Goldwater-Nichols legislation.

By extension, these experiences are being institutionalized by more diverse student populations and broader curricula at professional military education institutions. The mere fact that these are now recognizable joint experiences, in turn, leads to an officer corps who will seek out attainment of these desirable education experiences and opportunities in these areas.

Again, I want to thank you for this opportunity to testify on behalf of the Secretary and Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel Readiness on this topic. I look forward to your questions.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Hebert can be found in the Appendix on page 37.]

Dr. SNYDER. General Hix.

STATEMENT OF BG WILLIAM C. HIX, USA, DIRECTOR, OPERATIONAL PLANS AND JOINT FORCE DEVELOPMENT, J–7, JOINT CHIEFS OF STAFF

General HIX. Mr. Chairman, members of the subcommittee, thank you for the opportunity to discuss your——

Dr. SNYDER. Pull that microphone a little closer to you if you wouldn't mind.

General HIX. Yes, sir. Thank you for this opportunity to discuss the subcommittee's report. joint professional military education is and will remain an essential pillar of joint officer development, a Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff focus area. And we appreciate the subcommittee's continued emphasis on and support for joint professional military education across the entire education enterprise in the Department of Defense.

We welcome the subcommittee's review and we broadly concur with the report's conclusion that the professional military education system is basically sound and that there are systemic and

institutional areas that require our continued attention. As you are aware, the Joint Staff continues in conjunction with our service and DOD partners, a cross-Department effort to analyze the report's recommendations. We expect this analysis to inform decisions this winter.

While this effort continues, our preliminary conclusion gives broad endorsement to the report at the macro level. In conjunction with the Offices of Secretary of Defense and the services, the Joint Staff will continue to work through the report's recommendations in the coming months.

That said, our expectation is that the results of this effort will ultimately drive changes in policy and procedure, including the chairman's Officer Professional Military Education Policy, which guides joint professional military education across the services. We will persist in exploring all available avenues to improve and expand joint education to ensure our forces are equipped with the critical thinking skills and mental dexterity needed to succeed in all environments.

One such initiative to expand access to opportunities for rigorous joint education is our proposal for authority to allow the Joint Forces Staff College to provide an alternative nonresident Joint Professional Military Education Phase II program hosted by the combatant commands and the Joint Staff at offsite locations. That would be 10 locations in all. The proposal was carried in the Senate Armed Services Committee mark for the 2011 National Defense Authorization Act and we welcome this subcommittee's support.

As in all of our endeavors, Congress' consistent support of joint professional military education has and will continue to enable us to maintain a vibrant and relevant education enterprise. And for that, we are truly appreciative. I stand ready to address your questions. Thank you for this opportunity.

[The prepared statement of General Hix can be found in the Appendix on page 41.]

Dr. SNYDER. General MacFarland.

STATEMENT OF BG SEAN B. MACFARLAND, USA, DEPUTY COMMANDANT, COMMAND AND GENERAL STAFF COLLEGE, U.S. ARMY

General MACFARLAND. Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee, General Casey asked me to represent him here today because of my responsibilities, which include leader development for all warrant officers and all officers between the rank of captain and lieutenant colonel. And it is my pleasure to be able to provide input on the "Another Crossroads" report today and update you on the continuing progress in the Army's professional military education programs.

General Casey provided his personal insights in his letter on 6 October, and my job is to provide some additional details and also answer any questions that you might have. As General Casey noted, the Army appreciates the comprehensive review conducted by this committee. And we thank in particular, Dr. Lorry Fenner and her team, for the quality of their work and the positive and professional manner in which they carried it out. And we have

learned a lot from that experience and we have already begun to move forward on some of the findings and recommendations.

The Army fully participated in the survey and concurs with the analysis, observations, and recommendations. It is important for me to note that the Army has just approved the Army Learning Concept 2015, which is a comprehensive approach to education and training throughout the Army, and it includes the schools that the report discusses.

And I want to begin my remarks by providing a few of the most important examples of how the ALC [Army Learning Concept] 2015 supports the findings of "Another Crossroads."

One of your key findings noted that DOD should explore innovative avenues to develop the respective officer corps through education, training, assignments or experience. The cornerstone of ALC 2015 is, in fact, supporting a balance of education, training and experience over a career of professional growth and development. The document that will guide the Army through the process of change, and innovation in its education and training is this ALC. And it applies to all cohorts within the Army: civilian, noncommissioned officers, warrant, and commissioned. But it is clearly in step with your recommendations.

Also, we recognized the finding that we needed a central focal point or a full-time director of military education and the ALC 2015 does that. The position is called the Chief Learning Innovation Officer, or CLIO. And he will be a key advisor to the Training and Doctrine Command's Commander, General Dempsey, on military education. "Another Crossroads" also observed that TRADOC has been designated the manager for human capital development for the Army. And although we are early in that process, we believe that ALC 2015 reinforces our commitment to continued improvement of PME in the Army. We don't consider leader development just to be those times spent in the schoolhouse, but it is something that happens throughout your career. And now we are trying harder to ensure that we get the PME windows when it is needed and not just when officers are available.

I do want to highlight one place where we disagree with the report, and that is probably because we didn't provide the necessary information to your team and it may have led to some confusion. CGSC, Command and General Staff College, does, in fact, have 70 percent civilian faculty, but they are not contractors as the report stated. We only have a couple of contractors and they mostly work in the Digital Leader Development Center and not as primary instructors.

Finally, I just want to thank the committee for support on two issues critical to PME. First is extending JDAL [Joint Duty Assignment List] credit to our nonhost officers. That is critical, we believe, to providing high-quality JPME I credit to our students at intermediate level education. And secondly, we think that the committee did a great service by shining a light on the need for copyright ownership of scholarly works produced by our faculty. And your support of the Platts-Skelton amendment will improve the ability of our faculty to get published. And that will, we believe, enhance recruiting for civilian faculty members to come to our schools.

Finally, I just wanted to thank you for the opportunity to share the Army's views with you today, and we are already moving forward with many of the issues noted and this report will guide PME in the future just as its predecessor, the Skelton report, has for the past 20 years. And I stand ready to answer any questions. Thank you, sir.

[The prepared statement of General MacFarland can be found in the Appendix on page 46.]

Dr. SNYDER. Thank you, General. Mr. Lutterloh.

STATEMENT OF SCOTT LUTTERLOH, DIRECTOR, TOTAL FORCE TRAINING AND EDUCATION DIVISION, U.S. NAVY

Mr. LUTTERLOH. Good morning. Chairman Snyder, Representative Davis, and distinguished members of the Oversight and Investigation Subcommittee, thank you for the opportunity to discuss the Navy's views on the committee's April 2010 report, "Another Crossroads? Professional Military Education Two Decades After the Goldwater-Nichols Act and the Skelton Panel."

We appreciate the subcommittee's efforts in conducting such a comprehensive assessment of professional military education since enactment of Goldwater-Nichols. The major findings are accurate in identifying the fundamental issues warranting critical deliberation as we continue in our commitment to improve PME and the professional development of our officer corps.

We concur with the subcommittee's assessment that the PME system is sound. As with any program, there are areas for potential improvement. Navy places significant value on PME as we develop and enable resilient and adaptable leaders to meet challenges at the tactical, operational, and strategical levels of war.

Navy continues to emphasize PME as we provide unique and complementary maritime warfighting skills to joint and combined force commanders.

In response to the need for increased joint and service-specific subject matter to be taught earlier in an officer's career, Navy established a career continuum of PME. We have a sequence continuum of learning that provides relevant education aligned to clear progression, spanning E–1 through O–8, with a goal of providing Navy's Total Force with a standardized, comprehensive understanding of the Navy and its warfighting capabilities.

We are currently evaluating the report's recommendation that Navy consider instituting a quality board process for selection of the in-residence PME students by evaluating our screening process of top-performing officers for eligibility to attend service colleges. Under the leadership of the Vice Chief of Naval Operations, the Navy has appointed a cross-functional working group to evaluate the current selection processes for JPME in-residence education.

We concur with the report's observation, that while PME is a factor in cultivating strategists, it is not the primary means for developing future strategic decisionmakers. As noted in the report, Navy has a relatively advanced process for cultivating strategists. We acknowledge there is more to be done with respect to developing strategic decisionmakers, and are actively engaged in a review of how we develop our senior leaders. Competing demands for time in a

career track of officers of the unrestricted line remains a primary challenge.

Recently, we implemented new approaches to officer development through introduction of specialty career paths for unrestricted line officers. These specialty career paths allow Navy to better integrate training, education, and experiential tours focused on specialty areas while officers continue to serve in their warfare communities.

Navy takes a balanced approach to professional education that views operational competency and primacy of command as key professional measures for naval officers. professional military education has been instrumental in developing a highly educated and more effective leader. We value the flexibility provided by the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff which permits Navy to manage the content, quality, and conduct of our PME continuum.

On behalf of the Chief of Naval Operations and the entire Navy, thank you again for your exceptionally strong support of our military members and their family and for your career-long leadership in the professional development of our Navy Total Force.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Lutterloh can be found in the Appendix on page 59.]

Dr. SNYDER. Thank you. Mr. Sitterly.

STATEMENT OF DANIEL R. SITTERLY, DIRECTOR OF FORCE DEVELOPMENT, DEPUTY CHIEF OF STAFF FOR MANPOWER AND PERSONNEL, U.S. AIR FORCE

Mr. SITTERLY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee, for the opportunity to discuss Air Force Chief of Staff Schwartz's views on the "Crossroads" report. This is the fourth time in this Congress I have had the opportunity to testify on airmen development. Each time you help us to fine-tune the development of our most important weapons system, our Total Force airmen. Thank you.

We continue to develop talented and diverse airmen at the tactical, operational, and strategic level. We concur with the report's general tenet that the professional military education system is still basically sound, but with systemic and institutional areas that require a heightened focus and effort to improve. We endorse the idea that education has to be relevant to the student and the service, as well as inseparable from the execution of our developmental doctrine in support of service and joint organizational requirements.

The relevancy of education is one of the main premises that drive our desire and our ability to incorporate joint and service-specific subject matter into our curriculum and deliver that content to officers earlier in their careers, all in an effort to anticipate and adapt to current and future challenges.

Central to the report's concern and our focus is the necessity to develop strategists. Combined with a strong fellowship program, we recently added advanced academic degree opportunities in history, political science, international relations, economics, and philosophy to our portfolio. These new educational experiences are being earned at some of the Nation's most prestigious universities.

To an increased focus on critical thinking at junior levels, we are developing an officer corps that is capable of and empowered to solve the problems they will encounter throughout their careers.

I should also mention the importance we place on continuum of service in our country's entire national security arena. While we are all familiar with how strategic thinking airmen like Norty Schwartz and [General] Duncan McNabb transformed TRANSCOM's [Transportation Command] development and distribution operations—pardon me—deployment and distribution operations to the warfighter, for instance, let's not forget those airmen cultivated to think strategically who still serve in our country's defense out of uniform.

Dr. Lorry Fenner of this committee received her Ph.D. in history and is now one of the foremost authorities on military human capital in our country. Colonel (retired) Will Gunn leads the Veterans Administration's general counsel office. Colonel Hal Hoxie is making strategic decisions in matters incredibly important to our country and to the future of America as the President of Central Christian College. Airman Les Lyles is a defense industry strategic thinker, as well as Chairman of the Congressional Military Leadership Diversity Commission. Mark Clanton, Chuck Bush, Jim Finch, Chuck Greenwood, Blaine Tingle, Charles Garcia, are all involved in strategic thinking in the national security business every day using the education and experience developed in our Air Force.

Our primary PME mission is on the application of military power, but our development programs directly contribute to the diplomatic, international, and economic instruments both in and out of uniform.

Beyond content and delivery, we also concur with the report's finding that we have a need to address faculty and resource concerns at our institutions; therefore, we are in the process of reviewing policies regarding our hiring practices, job advancement, and academic freedom, as well as copyright and intellectual property concerns.

The Air Force has made significant advances in the past two years in our approach to developmental education. We have upped our game with a new on-line Air Command and Staff College program to complete transformation of company-grade officer professional military education, new advanced courses within Air Command and Staff College and Air War College, and expanded enrollment in progress toward a doctoral program in the School of Advanced Air and Space Studies.

These efforts, combined with conducive military personnel and developmental opportunities, will allow us to continue forging the synergistic relationship between Air Force training, experience, and education.

As evidenced by the "Crossroads" report, your insight and continued support ensures our ability to fly, fight, and win in aerospace and in cyberspace. Thank you. I look forward to answering any questions you may have.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Sitterly can be found in the Appendix on page 64.]

Dr. SNYDER. Thank you, Mr. Sitterly. General Neller.

STATEMENT OF MAJ. GEN. ROBERT NELLER, USMC, PRESIDENT, MARINE CORPS UNIVERSITY

General NELLER. Chairman Snyder, Representative Davis, good morning. Thank you for permitting me to discuss and represent the Marine Corps' views on the report, "Another Crossroads." The Marine Corps deeply appreciates the extensive research, analysis, and documentation contained in the report.

The work of the subcommittee provided a thorough assessment of the status of PME and, more importantly, provided sound recommendations on a variety of issues that will improve our educational programs. We have carefully reviewed the report and are already at work implementing many of the recommendations.

Additionally, we continue to work closely with the Joint Staff and the other services to ensure a coordinated approach as we examine each issue.

The Marine Corps, and Marine Corps University in particular, is constantly reviewing and revising our PME programs to ensure we meet the needs of the operating forces and prepare our leaders. We strengthen the faculty and the staff of our schools and colleges and continually review our curriculum for relevance. We plan infrastructure improvements and technology enhancements that we believe will dramatically improve the learning environment for our students.

While we will make our quality resident officer programs even better, our current emphasis, as you know from your visit down to Quantico, is the improvement of our enlisted PME programs. As noted in the "Issues for Further Studies" section of the report, progress has been made here, but much work remains to be done to fully prepare our enlisted leaders.

Last month, General Amos published his Commandant's Planning Guidance identifying professional military education as one of his top priorities. In fact, today at 13:30, he is holding an in-progress review, which I will participate in, to discuss where we are with education.

Excuse me. His guidance directs that plans be developed to increase the number of Marines attending resident officer and enlisted education programs and to continue to further develop Marine Corps University into a world-class institution. We are in the process of developing options to increase attendance in our programs without sacrificing quality or desired learning outcomes. We believe we have made substantial progress in strengthening our faculty, students, and curricula.

We are also on course to make significant progress in our facilities. For example, we have over $120 million in MILCON [military construction] programmed over the next 3 years for educational facilities. I am also pleased to report that the Expeditionary Warfare School Distributed Education Network, or EDEN, an item of interest during a subcommittee visit, is now fully funded and will be operational as soon as we can procure the equipment and implement the concept. The Commandant's Planning Guidance and the subcommittee report complement each other and provide a good roadmap to improve our already strong PME programs.

Again, we appreciate the support of Congress and specifically this subcommittee for military PME, and I stand ready to answer your questions. Thank you.

[The prepared statement of General Neller can be found in the Appendix on page 68.]

Dr. SNYDER. Thank you all.

Mrs. Davis, would you like to begin? [Mrs. Davis indicated no.] We will go back and forth on the 5-minute clock here. One of the reasons we did this report is it had been some time since the Armed Services Committee had really looked at PME. There has been a lot going on for the last decade, but I think it was also one of those topics that didn't get the attention it probably deserved even before the events of the last decade.

My question is, as you look forward 2 years, 3 years, 5 years, 8 years, whatever, down the line, what mechanisms do you see that are in place to assess how well the PME system is doing, the in-residence officer PME system, and does it need to be changed, revisited? What are your assessment tools about how well the system is working?

I will—General Neller, let us just begin with you and go backwards this time.

General NELLER. We are always in the process of assessing, at least internally, how we are doing. Obviously the committee report provides an external assessment. Every class that graduates from Command and Staff or MCWAR [Marine Corps War College], or even Expeditionary Warfare School for our captains, we go out to the operating force who receive these officers and ask them if they have met the requirement. I mean, are they satisfied with what they are receiving.

Again, I take the response that people's time is valuable and short, but we get an almost 100 percent positive response on the quality of the education that these officers receive. We also ask the officers if they believe that we prepared them for their service. And again, their answers, in my opinion, are a little bit more candid. But, again, the overwhelming majority, 90-plus percent, in almost all categories felt the experience and the educational experience that they gained while they were at Marine Corps University helped them better perform their duties, whether it is in a staff or a command position.

We also look at our own objectives. We use the tasks that came out of the Wilhelm Study in 2006 to self-assess ourselves as to whether or not we are making progress. As your report noted, we do have some facilities and infrastructure issues which, in the last year, because of decisions by the Commandant to fund facilities which are going to house the infrastructure, I really see the new buildings as technology that is just in a building. I think we are going to make progress there. So those are what we have internally to self-assess.

Mr. SITTERLY. Thank you for that question. I agree, as primarily a force provider, it is important that we go to our commanders, our combatant commanders, especially in the field, to ask if we are providing them officers that have both the experience and the education necessary to execute our military requirements in a joint environment. For instance, we found that we had a gap in our more

junior officers and their ability to operate as we are deploying folks in this environment, more junior than perhaps we had in the past. So we have totally revamped now our basic developmental education at the Squadron Officers School, an Air and Space Basic Course, to adapt the curricula to that.

Additionally, we found from combatant commanders that they valued those students that we put through our School of Advanced Air and Space Studies. And so we have increased that program so that we are selecting more people to put into that program with that curriculum, in addition to that feedback that we get from the field. Thank you.

Mr. LUTTERLOH. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. In the case of the Naval War College, in addition to the internal assessments, I would say that there were some other training objectives that are completed by the War College. For example, maritime component commander training, Joint Staff training for our operational commands that actually put the president of the War College in training and education situations with COCOMs [combatant commanders] in theater two to three times a year. So he is getting direct feedback from those leaders on the quality of the education.

In addition to that, the significant war-gaming capability at War College has always led to the identification of areas where the Navy needs to move in terms of maritime dominance, and specifically where the War College needs to move with their curricula.

And finally I would point out that the Military Education Coordination Council, our robust participation in that, is what leads to driving change into the curricula across the board and standardizing it across the services and throughout the joint community. Thank you.

General MACFARLAND. Well, right now we are in an era of persistent conflict. And probably the ultimate indicator of how well we are doing in PME will be how well we are doing on the battlefield. And we believe that PME is the key to agile thinkers. And we are constantly reevaluating and assessing how we go about creating creative and adaptive leaders.

The assessments mentioned by General Neller and others are part of our assessment process, both asking the students and asking their commanders out there. Another way we can assess the value of PME is based on the demand for PME, the officers seeking admission to PME, the competition for going to school, and also the demand in the field for PME graduates.

Right now we are frequently asked to hurry up and graduate more SAMS, School of Advanced Military Studies, officers. There is a high demand for those trained planners out there in the force. Obviously, people attach a great deal of importance on the value of that professional military educational experience. So we are doing something right there. And we are hoping to expand that across all of PME.

Lately, there has been a devaluation in the minds of many of our officers of the value of education. They value experience. Getting more hash marks on the sleeve is perceived as more important than going and sitting in a school. We are trying to address that balance with the Army Learning Concept 2015. And when more officers vote with their feet and try to go to school instead of get a

third or a fourth tour down range, we will know that we are obviously providing value to the force and—when members of the force see that.

General HIX. Mr. Chairman, I endorse the comments of my colleagues here, and I will offer a slightly different perspective, given my responsibilities for oversight on behalf of the chairman.

Since 2000, my staff and members of the various schools, universities, and colleges run by the military have conducted 44 PAJE visits. And these are Process of Accreditation of Joint Education visits not unlike the accreditation that universities and colleges go through to offer civilian master's degrees, but focused on joint professional military education and their adherence to the OPMEP [Officer PME Policy], looking at best practices in terms of how they deliver a joint education and that sort of thing.

As part of that review, we also dig into their own assessment programs. And each of them has a very comprehensive program as they have laid out, focused on not only the perspective of the student but also of the customer, which is, of course, the commanders, be they service commanders or joint operational commanders. And those assessments very clearly indicate a demand for additional education, more of what these universities and colleges deliver, as well as a reflection from many of the students that they were glad that they had gotten some of that education before they actually went into an assignment.

I can tell you anecdotally that the staff officers that work for me and those that I have worked with in the past in assignments at large headquarters, and also in the Pentagon, all note the fact that they were leveraging the education they received at a War College, be it from the National Defense University, ICAF [Industrial College of the Armed Forces], or National War College or one of the service schools.

Lastly, to build off of comments of General MacFarland, the demand from the field is also very clear. We have seen this from the combatant commands, that they are looking for more joint education and actually having it sooner. The throughput at the universities and at the Joint Forces Staff College for Joint Professional Military Education Level II is challenged to meet the demands of the joint authorizations out in the combatant commands and now with forces in Iraq and Afghanistan.

And so we have looked at how to meet that demand more broadly. And I think that is your best indicator of whether the product that is being put out by those who educate our officers is useful, is the fact that they are demanding more of the same.

Mr. HEBERT. Sir, as my colleagues have described to you, we have a system of measures, if you will, to ensure that we are meeting the demands in the future, whether it be the internal school practices, assessments, the Military Education Coordination Council, which OSD [Office of the Secretary of Defense] participates in, as well as the PAJE visits which we participate in. We see this whole system of measures, if you will, are indicators taken together. Whether or not change is required. For our part, OSD is taking the recommendations of the committee's report seriously in that we are reconsidering our role in this entire enterprise to determine how we can best create synergy between the service efforts

and the Joint Staff efforts and lend to creating an opportunity that in the future we can anticipate the needs of the students far in advance of when they might be required.

Dr. SNYDER. Mrs. Davis.

Mrs. DAVIS. Thank you all for your responses. I was interested—I think General Hix first mentioned the fact that we are fighting two wars. And I know that in the meetings that we had, there was some discussion about the fact that it was difficult for people to take time off for PME time, a very, you know, big problem that all of the services were experiencing. So I just wonder if you could respond to that a little bit more in terms of—I think you have talked about the broadening of the experiences in many ways.

There probably couldn't be a better teacher than applying the knowledge and the strategic thinking that is really required. But I wonder at the same time how difficult a problem you think that is and if there is anything else that we should be supporting or helping with to be sure that there is certainly a high incentive for people to find a way to have that time. And again, we are talking not just about thinking about fighting the wars that we are fighting today, but the future wars and how we get that from those who are in the services today, and certainly our officers.

Anybody want to—you have sort of talked—you obviously have plans to think about that. But I wonder if you could just focus on that and the extent to which you think that is truly a problem and what we are actually doing to send that message.

General HIX. Ma'am, I will take the first shot, then, as you mentioned me by name. I would tell you as part of the PAJE process, we look at not only the delivery of in-resident education, but also the delivery of nonresident or distributed-learning education. And as you know, currently JPME II is delivered only in-residence. And I think that at the time that those strictures were codified, it made sense because the art of distributed learning is not what it is today.

And I have to say from my own perspective of having visited several of the colleges in my time as a J7 [Joint Staff Operational Plans and Joint Force Development], there are some pretty innovative approaches and some very interactive means of instruction that certainly did not exist, you know, years ago, several years ago. And you actually—in one case, I observed a class being conducted where students were in a chat room, literally globally, dealing with a problem, and frankly in some cases, actually dealing with the problem more as if they would be—as if they were actually doing it for real, because they weren't all in the same classroom where they could talk and make coordination easy.

So in terms of learning how to, you know, deal with a very critical problem, a complex problem, deliver rapidly critical thinking, that sort of thing, we have come a long way. And, frankly, that is really the basis—and I will harp on this one more time—the basis of our legislative proposal to allow us to start with looking at the art of the possible and in this case the delivery of JPME II in a very controlled environment, 10 sites across the combatant commands where you have an automatic joint pool of officers that provides, you know, one of the key points of joint experiences—interaction with other services. And it is done at the combatant commands where they are demanding more officers have the joint edu-

cation opportunity. And from that, we can then learn to—more about how we deliver JPME II in a distributed environment and see if we can then transfer that to our combatant command—I am sorry—our service colleagues who currently are only able to deliver JPME I credit from a distributed learning perspective. Thank you.

General NELLER. I think, Representative Davis, your question—and correct me if I am wrong—deals with the kind of inevitable tension between deploying and getting to the fight and going to school. Again, this is my opinion. I think at the beginning—and I think General MacFarland talked about this—there was a tremendous drive that, you know, you had to get to the fight because, you know, for all the good reasons. You wanted to participate and test yourself and be involved. But as this has gone on longer, I think most people have been, and so now they see—take a longer view.

And so I think there has been a shift and that people understanding that, all right, I have been, I am competitive, I am still going to be considered qualified for promotion, I need to get my education and I get the other benefit of a year where my family and I get some stability. And I can't prove that, but that is my personal view that I think that is part of the reason that the force has been as sustainable as it has, because officers have been able to take time off to go to school and not take a break but get educated, but at the same time have some sort of normalcy in their personal and in their family life.

So I think at least for the foreseeable future, I think there will be more and more people who will see school not as an inconvenience but as both a benefit for them personally and for them professionally. But that tension is always going to be there and, again, it is going to depend on where that individual officer, where he or she is in their career; are they coming from the operating forces and going to school so that they feel competent that they have good solid operational background? Are they coming from the supporting establishment and there is this desire to get back to the fight, it is their turn to go again. And professional military education will assist them in either way. So we are seeing a slight shift, at least in talking in non—I can't document this. This is my assessment, that more and more people are seeing the benefit and advantage of going to resident PME.

General MACFARLAND. Ma'am, General Neller is exactly right, as always. But I just wanted to add on a little. The Army has recognized that perhaps some of our officers need additional incentive to get into the schoolhouse, because without that mentoring or coaching to enter resident education, they just simply will stay away and continue to rack up additional experience.

So we are trying to put teeth back into our professional military education policies where promotion and selection for command will be not available to the officers who do not have the requisite schooling. So we have kind of drifted away from that, under the duress of the demands of the operational force. We are coming back to that.

One of the big challenges we had is the Army is unique in that we have gone to universal intermediate-level education. All majors are required to attend some form of school, either distributed learning, like General Hix mentioned, or resident, or a blended version

of that with partial resident, partial distributed. And we have looked at our capacity for that and have expanded that to meet the demand. Now we just need to get the officers into the programs. And that is what the policies will do.

Finally, we have looked at our younger officers, the captains, and we are looking at a pilot program for a captain's career course that doesn't require as much in-residence time, and the rest of the resident time will be determined partially by a learning assessment prior to attending school so it is more modular tailored to the officer rather than industrial age—well, this is what year group you are in, so you will attend this schooling. It is more learner-centric, officer-centric. And that is all part of the Army Learning Concept 2015. Thank you.

Mr. LUTTERLOH. Representative Davis, I just would like to comment on three things quickly. I agree wholeheartedly with General Hix. Distributed JPME II will go a long way to providing additional opportunities for our officers to get the joint qualification, the joint education that they need in their careers to adequately man those joint combatant commands. So anything that we can do to facilitate that is very useful. I understand very well that there is a tradeoff between 10 months, 10 to 12 months in residence, and the ability to spend valuable time in seminars talking and thinking with compatriots of other services and even the international and interagency community, but there is also tremendous value in a 10-week very focused time frame in which those officers are gaining some of the very same concepts in joint warfighting that are the items that are needed in theater.

Secondly, I will be leaving next week to travel to Newport to travel to the War College to invest an entire day in investigating the art of the possible relative to distributed learning. Not so much to supplant JPME I or JPME II, but to look at innovative ways by which we can educate our officers over a prolonged period of time, perhaps through interactive distributed seminars, perhaps through war games over a weekend, perhaps tailored to certain career points, career milestones. I will be investigating those aspects with the War College to see where we can go maybe on a different vector than we have considered so far.

The third and last thing is an aggressive policy pursuit. So I also agree with General MacFarland here. We have rather aggressively addressed some of these issues through policy. We combined our surface combatant executive officer and commanding officer tours into one, to shorten that period of time aboard the ship and provide additional opportunity in the career pipeline for advanced education. We have also insisted, policy-wise, on completion of JPME I prior to assuming command at the commander command. We have thought about it at major command perhaps for JPME II completion. We continue to aggressively pursue policy issues there.

And in conjunction with our selection process, the review that was recommended by the panel, I believe the combination of these three things will put us in pretty good position for the future. Thank you.

Mr. SITTERLY. If I could just add from the Air Force perspective, we face some of the same challenges. And the complexity of the current operations does require us, I think, to look at both the stu-

dents, but also the faculty. And we value both the depth and the breadth of experience. So for the faculty, we want to ensure that we give our instructors the opportunity not only to establish their academic credentials, but also to bring into the classroom a current operations perspective. So there is a very short period of time in a career to get a lot of things done from command to staff to, you know, deployments, faculty, so on and so forth. So as we noted in our report, as General Schwartz noted, we would like to continue our dialogue with our colleagues on the faculty-to-student ratio in the OPMEP. Thank you.

Mr. HEBERT. Representative Davis, I want to capitalize on the comments of my colleagues. I would offer that there is no one ideal method of delivering professional military education. It differs by officer. It differs in many cases by virtue of where they are in their individual careers. By having a broad spectrum of opportunities to deliver joint professional military education or professional military education in the services case, we create the diversity of the force and thinking that you wouldn't normally have if you had a single institution, just as you wouldn't normally send all of your engineers to one institution, because they would all come away with a very similar thought pattern in many cases.

You wouldn't—we believe professional military education is similarly suited. Having distributed courses at various combatant commands attunes those officers who attain school with that combatant command a certain knowledge that others may not have if they went to National War College or elsewhere. So I would just leave you with that thought.

Dr. SNYDER. Maybe I will just direct this question at the two of you there. If anyone disagrees—but some of the issues you have been talking about, both students and faculties, where does the education fit into their career? And early on when we were talking with students and even faculty, we would hear reports from the combatant commanders that some students were going to a school long past the time that they should have, so it didn't speak much to them because they had already learned that; or they are being sent to a billet where they should have had the school, and 2 or 3 months into that billet that combatant commander is having to send that person to a school, which he wished he had had before they got there.

And we heard the same thing with faculty, by the way. If somebody is assigned to be a faculty member, they really wanted to be a wing commander or something.

But how much are those kind of things that you deal with out of your control because they are really a product of the personnel system and moving people around? How much control do you all have and influence do you have over having a personnel system come up so that it really can, in a very sophisticated manner, look at both where they are at in their career, where they are going to go, where that particular 10-month break, for example, fits in an appropriate way both for the student and the military.

Mr. HEBERT. If I may lead off. In 2007, when Congress enacted legislation which removed the sequencing requirement, it created the flexibility for the Department to make sure that we could better time that professional military education in that officer's career.

Whether it be exactly adjacent to that Joint Staff tour or perhaps it is just prior to sending him off to the desert for a deployment, what it allowed for was a much greater flexibility, not less flexibility as we moved forward.

Now, we have only had a couple of years under this enhanced Goldwater-Nichols legislation, but what we are seeing is the services do have greater flexibility in timing it to both attune it to the officer's future potential to serve and additional grades beyond that, but to also consider whether that officer is going to be well-timed for a combatant command tour, a Joint Staff tour, a future deployment. But the underlying problem is what General Hix identified earlier: Demand far outstrips our ability to provide or develop officers, particularly the JPME II level. We believe we have solved that at the JPME I level but not at the JPME II level.

General HIX. Sir, I will only comment briefly on this, as my personal responsibilities are focused on the education aspect and that manpower management is not within my purview.

Dr. SNYDER. But it has great influence over what happens.

General HIX. It does indeed, sir. And I will touch on one issue, particularly regarding faculty. In general, especially with the joint officers, you know, education in general flows appropriately in the macro sense. You go to staff college, you get a branch qualifying job, if you will, within your service, whether it is a department-head tour or as a staff officer in a brigade or a division, and then you get a joint assignment, say, as an action officer. You have JPME I, you have staff experience, you have combat experience now obviously in many cases. Where those O–4s may step up or get promoted while they are in a joint assignment, the combatant command does have the option, the opportunity to send their officers effectively out of cycle to the resident JPME II program down at Joint Forces Staff College to kind of add or hone their skills at the operational level. That throughput is, admittedly, inadequate. And again, that is one of the reasons that we have proposed this expansion of nonresident delivery of that program, so that more officers at the combatant command level where the majority of this demand comes from for JPME II-qualified officers, provides that flexibility so the combatant commander doesn't have to give up 10 weeks of an officer's time on his staff but can work this in parallel, if you will, with their day job and do so in a way that is consistent.

And, in fact, we have looked at some of the ways the services deliver this capability. They will actually—you can—regardless of where you are in the world, if you walk into some of the distributed learning seminars that they have, you may be assigned to Norfolk. And if you are in Hawaii and you are attending the distributed learning course, you actually walk into almost—you know, the course is identical in terms of how it is delivered. So that is the kind of approach that we are looking at, so that as officers move, as they are—if you are in CENTCOM [Central Command] and you are coordinating with EUCOM [European Command] and you happen to be in Germany and not down in Tampa, you can still pick up that course on that day and stick with your education opportunities.

As far as the officers' piece and their participation as faculty, as Mr. Hebert noted, the opportunity for JDAL positions for non-host

faculty is a great step forward. However, there are team partners who are from the host faculty who are teaching joint matters as well, and, frankly, it has been my observation that there is a great synthesis that is gained in actually teaching these, you know, joint operational approaches. And I think expanding that opportunity so that those officers who are teaching joint matters, even though they are at the Army War College or at the Command and General Staff College, would be an opportunity that would expand participation across the board, and, frankly, I think meet some of the concerns of the officers that you interviewed.

Dr. SNYDER. Do any of you have any comment on that topic?

General MacFarland, by the way, I think that my guess is that will be a bridge too far, at least at this time, for an Army officer, at an Army institution teaching joint matters. I think that will probably be considered a bridge too far.

But I might get in my licks here on the defense bill. I think there are a couple of items on the Senate side that they have not yet done their defense bill, and I still have some optimism that we will get a defense bill out of this Congress in the next couple or 3 weeks.

But this is complicated stuff, and the sooner you can get up here, particularly with a new Congress coming in and new leadership, the more likely you-all's recommendations will be included as part of the defense bill next year, although I think a couple of items that we have been supportive of on this side didn't get in the Senate side, so if we get a defense bill, we will work to preserve those if we can.

General MACFARLAND. I appreciate your support on that.

Dr. SNYDER. Several issues I wanted to ask. General MacFarland, I think it was you that brought up the issue of copyright. We had talked about that. In fact, I think maybe it was last year I had some thought that we ought to be able to do something on the House side in the defense bill. It turns out it is a pretty complicated issue. I know Mr. Platts and Mr. Skelton had tried it some years ago, I think, unsuccessfully.

So if this issue is important, and I think it is, and it would seem to me that it is solvable, we may need to get a little joint discussion group going on with some smart lawyers from the military side, and some smart lawyers from here, but also some smart lawyers perhaps from the Judiciary Committee and some others to sit down and figure out, okay, where are the concerns that you all have and the concerns of those who think this isn't perhaps the way to go, and try to sort that out. Because we tried to come to some language and met resistance along the way.

So it is easy for us to recognize the problem. I am not sure it is going to be as easy as I think, or originally thought, to solve it. That will be something you want to work on.

General MacFarland, I think, talked in the most detail about getting students from the civilian side. You mentioned the interagency swap. Was that your statement? I think it was.

General MACFARLAND. It is in my written statement.

Dr. SNYDER. Written statement, yes.

I would like all of you to comment on that, if you would. Our experience was that when we visited some of the seminar groups at

the different institutions, that our military personnel, you know, would have paid money or had a payroll deduction if they could have had some additional State Department, Foreign Service officers in their seminar groups with them.

How are we doing? And as you are looking ahead, how are we doing, do you think, at getting the numbers of civilian government personnel from the other agencies of government to be in these courses?

I will start with you, General Neller.

General NELLER. I think our situation is very good, and I think it is directly related just to our geography. The fact that we are just south of Washington, it is much easier for the Federal Government agencies to send someone to be a student down at Quantico than it is for them to send them to Kansas, or to Alabama, or even to Rhode Island.

So we are doing very well. I mean, 4 of 27 at MCWAR [Marine Corps War College], almost 1 per seminar at Command and Staff. So we are very content, and we are happy with the quality of person that we get. So I think we are blessed by—hopefully by reputation, but probably more so by geography.

Mr. SITTERLY. We are doing better as well, and the quality seems to be getting better as well as we continue to go through this and those students go back and talk about their experiences with their particular agency.

The other thing we are doing is trying to approach it from the other end, and that is we are exploring fellowships where we can actually take our military officers into their programs. We recently did one at the senior level with the State Department. So we are approaching it from both ends. But we certainly appreciate what those interagency folks bring to the fight.

Dr. SNYDER. I think the Army has been the most aggressive about doing swaps, correct?

General MACFARLAND. Yes, sir. We have 28 interagency fellows right now at the major level, ILE [Intermediate Level Education], and I think the number is about 70 at the War College fellowship level. But the War College fellows are more in academia, think tanks, places like that. Our interagency fellows are plugged right into Homeland Security or U.S. Department of Agriculture.

I just had a meeting with FEMA [Federal Emergency Management Agency] last week, and they are looking at sending two of their officers in exchange for two of ours going to work in FEMA for a year. And, of course, State Department SCRS [Coordinator for Reconstruction and Stabilization] is a big partner of ours, sir.

Dr. SNYDER. Mr. Lutterloh.

Mr. LUTTERLOH. Yes, sir. We just recently began expanding our fellowships into interagencies, most recently discussions about State Department, so it looks like we will be sending a couple fellowships to the State Department this year.

Our faculty at the War College has been in the process of transitioning. Our provost and dean of faculty Ambassador Peters comes with a very strong background in interagency support, as well as some of the other members of the faculty that she is drawing into the fold. We are trying to increase our student representa-

tion from some of the other agencies to get that vital discussion going. I think we are making progress there.

The last point I will leave you with is we have also been focusing over the years on international cooperation, so that that international piece of it is also important to us.

Dr. SNYDER. Yes, it is.

I think I will address this question to the two of you again as the overseers. One of the detail issues that we talked about through the last year was it has been difficult to look at the services and to come up with an apples-to-apples comparison of cost per student, which I think would be helpful to everyone. Maybe it is impossible.

I mean, you know, General Neller mentioned geography. Maybe it is a lot cheaper getting somebody to come to Quantico than it is to Kansas. I don't know. It seems like it shouldn't be that difficult.

Where are we at with that issue of having the different institutions or the different services come up with a cost per student of doing the kinds of in-residence PME, or are we nowhere?

Mr. HEBERT. Sir, we are further than nowhere, but we are not where we should be. So it is one of those issues that continues to plague us. The trade-off, as you probably well understand, is having the service having a measure that is meaningful for them versus a measurement that is not meaningful for them but is universally applied to all at the same time. So we are working with the services to work through this issue.

Dr. SNYDER. It seems like at some point you will come up with a number, I guess, and send it up here, but it is not something that is necessarily helpful to us. It seems like it would be helpful to you on the institutions if you can see, you know, one service has gotten dramatically more efficient. I bet that would be helpful in trying to figure out how people save money. It is consistent with what Secretary Gates is trying to do as far as saving money also. I think over the long haul you all are going to try to make the case that you are efficient and deserve the money.

Does anybody else have any comment on that?

General HIX. Yes, sir, I do. Before I answer that, if I could just very briefly on the civilian participation thing.

Right now we have about, depending on the year, 5 to 10 percent of the student body across the board is from our other agencies, and we expect about 290 next year. Some of the challenges that have been raised to us—we do sensing sessions as part of this PAJE process—the feedback we get from the civilian representatives from these other agencies is, one, their agencies are taking a hit by sending them to school because they don't have a float.

As you know, the uniformed services have the ability to transfer an officer into the TTHS [Trainees, Transients, Holdees, and Students] account, and it doesn't, therefore, take an officer out of a staff or out of a brigade or out of a battalion to send them to school. There is a replacement available. So that is the first thing.

The second thing is, in general, the other agencies appear to manage the billet, not the man, and so when the person, male or female, goes off to school, they may or may not have a job when they come back, and that is a challenge for them personally.

Then some other feedback we have received is there is concern about, you know, some of the regulations on housing, and I know this is particularly true with civilian faculty, members from other agencies or faculty members who could, if they were in the military, live on base, but find it is a challenge for them because of regulatory and other issues.

And the last piece, again anecdotally, is that frankly some of your fellow committees are less interested in this integration than others, and that translates into whether there is support on the Hill for those agencies to be aggressive in putting their personnel into our military schools at the degree that we certainly would like to see them.

Dr. SNYDER. That may be something as time goes along it might be helpful to in some informal way figure out who we need to go talk to, because I think, I mean, it is clear to me when you talk to the students, both the military and the civilian side, they both benefit greatly from it. Particularly when you do these swaps, too, that is very helpful to both sides.

General HIX. Absolutely, sir.

Sir, just very briefly, on the issue of cost comparisons, we are collecting the cost vectors from the services right now. They are varied, as you can imagine, and there are a lot of drivers which, at this point, because we haven't actually gotten all the data, and I can't give you a firm assessment of why the costs vary per student, but I am sure there are issues of geography, physical plant. I mean, there are a number of issues, transportation of those officers to and from the schools and that sort of thing. So we will continue to work that issue, because it is of interest to all of us.

Dr. SNYDER. I think back, General, on your comment about you are getting some pushback from, I guess, the congressional side on sharing, having civilians participate. I remember on a report that we did on PRTs [Provincial Reconstruction Teams] a couple of years ago as coincidentally somebody from my district who is a veterinarian with the Department of Agriculture, who served in both Iraq and Afghanistan, at some point she sent us an e-mail that we included in our report which said—she just volunteered, she said, I sometimes feel like there are more barriers between the different agencies of our government than there are between us and the Iraqis.

I mean, she really meant it, that she could go out and talk to a group of farmers or government Ag [agriculture] people that are Iraqi and felt like she made more progress than sometimes trying to talk to other agencies of government. So I think that is the motivation. We are trying to break down those barriers, and maybe it starts here in Congress.

I will direct it here and then any comments you all have again. As we are talking about these slots and the availability of PME, if we had a group of National Guard and Marine Corps Reserve, Army Reserve, Navy Reserve, Air Force Reserve people, would they all feel like there were adequate slots for their personnel, adequate opportunities for Guard and Reserve personnel?

Mr. HEBERT. I think it would depend largely on which level of education we are talking about.

Dr. SNYDER. At which level do you think?

Mr. HEBERT. Well, JPME II throughput is admittedly short of demand, both for the Active Component as well as for the Reserve Components.

Dr. SNYDER. Disproportionately for the Reserve Component?

Mr. HEBERT. Two percent of officers each year, and 1.5 percent for the Reserve Component. But I think largely the feedback I have gotten from the Reserve Component service members dealt with the AJPME [Advanced Joint PME], their equivalent JPME II course. And it wasn't so much about the course per se, it was the many demands the reservists face. They have to balance the demands of a full-time position, civilian position, the demands of their Reserve Component, the demands of the family, the demands in many cases of pursuing advanced education, and the demands of pursuing in some cases at the same time professional military education.

So it is trying to find ways that we can better facilitate that within those competing demands so it is not so onerous on them, so it doesn't come at a time when all of these issues are brought to bear at the exact same time. So from the Reserve Component feedback that I have received, that is the largest issue.

I have also received some feedback on the Capstone course and not having enough throughput there in order to accommodate all the demand they have. So it is the top two levels of PME for them.

General HIX. I would just echo that point, that their real focus is on JPME II. AJPME provides them with an equivalent accreditation. I think that there is a concern that it is not seen as equal to the actual JPME II course. I believe that if we are able to expand JPME II into this distributed option, that will be the first step in providing a more flexible access for our Reserve Component into that curriculum on a larger basis.

There has, however, been a reasonably significant increase in the number of Reserve Component, both Reserve Title 10 and Title 32 National Guard officers, in both resident JPME II as well as in Capstone, so there is a concerted effort to do that. But there is a balance, because there is a requirement particularly to look at the number of joint billets that are populated by reservists above the State level. I know that the National Guard has implemented joint headquarters at the State level, but above the State level, those National Guard officers who—like General Sherlock, who are—actually, I guess, he is a reservist—who is the Chief of Staff at AFRICOM [Africa Command]. I mean, those kinds of Reserve officers clearly need to have access to that level of education.

But right now, the throughput is a challenge, as your study outlines, across the board.

Dr. SNYDER. Do any of you have any comments on that issue?

General NELLER. I think, in the aggregate, that there are issues with Reserve-Guard PME. In fact, I have got a meeting next week with General Darrell Moore, who is a Reserve general who works Reserve Affairs for our manpower, to talk about this. I think as mentioned, JPME II is probably the toughest one, but I think it goes further down.

Just as on the officer side you have to have JPME II to be considered for flag rank, on the enlisted side, if you are a gunnery sergeant, you have to have the advanced course. And we recently ran

a Reserve advanced enlisted PME course, and we had slots for 100, and 105 Marines showed up, and we put them all through, because we knew if they got there, that we are going to give them the opportunity to go to the course.

So, I don't know what the answers are. We have slots at Command and Staff and the other schools for Reserves, and they are filled. We have a very aggressive non-res program through the College of Distance Education and Training, where I think most of them get their PME for the officer side.

But just as the Joint Staff and OSD is looking at a regional approach to JPME II, in line with what the Commandant has asked us to do, one of our COAs [courses of action] is probably going to consider a regional campus, more of a hybrid, a blended-type seminar, where you have a resident and non-resident portion, which I think most people would feel is potentially superior to a fully non-res on line, and I think we will see a lot of our Reserves hopefully, because they are in the local area, at lower cost, be able to take advantage of that, too.

So it is an issue. JPME II is probably the biggest, but I think it filters all the way through the force.

Mr. LUTTERLOH. Yes, sir. Chairman Snyder, I would just add that we have increased our Reserve throughput through Navy War College over the past 2 years, marginally so, but increasing nonetheless, and the Reserve force is actively interested in additional quotas through the War College. So we will actively pursue that movement forward.

I would also point out that we have about 2,900 officers in the war right now, and nearly half of those are Reserve officers. So this education is very well needed in that part of the force. How we resource it moving forward, how we address that throughput, and our ability to accommodate that throughput is going to be something we have to deal with. But we are actively engaged in this issue.

General MACFARLAND. Sir, I just wanted to add one thing about the Total Army School System is really tailored to our Reserve officers and noncommissioned officers and giving them the opportunity to get professional military education and JPME I for our majors.

We have a brigade with six battalions distributed around the country, and it is somewhat blended, where you spend a couple weeks in residence, places like Fort McCoy, Wisconsin, and then you meet in seminar or staff group-type formats instead of your drill periods over the course of a year, and then you come back together for another couple of weeks. And we have very good faculty out there doing that for our Reserve officers. So they get a good JPME educational experience through the Total Army School System, even though they don't necessarily come to Fort Leavenworth or one of our satellite campuses.

Dr. SNYDER. I think, as you all know, this subcommittee and the full committee have taken an interest in foreign language skills in our military, and, in fact, Mr. Kruse has got a draft and updated report I need to sign off here in the next day or two from the report we did a year and a half ago.

I would just like any general comments you have about where you see foreign-language training fitting into this. And then specifi-

cally one of the concerns all along about this is how do you get that 25th hour in a 24-hour day for further foreign-language training?

The QDR [Quadrennial Defense Review] Independent Review Panel suggested one way to get at that is—for your ROTC [Reserve Officers' Training Corps] students—is just to increase the requirement for what they bring in for increased foreign language proficiency. And I would like any of your comments about foreign language in general, but also that specific comment.

I am going to start with you again, General Neller.

General NELLER. This is a very difficult issue, Mr. Chairman. At one point in Command and Staff College, they tried to implement as part of their curriculum a foreign-language program, and I think that the consensus was that the effort just didn't result in a positive benefit. The Command and Staff still does a key leader engagement exercise where they have to use an interpreter, but there is not a specific language requirement.

Recently the Marine Corps has required commanders, because of key leader engagement mission-essential tasks in theater, that they have to do 40 hours of language before they deploy. And the Marine Corps, again, this is out of my area, but at the basic school, lieutenants still are being assigned a general area where they are supposed to develop language, but, again, it is on their own time; there is not an enforcement function on that.

Again, you are putting more rocks in the ruck of a ROTC student, but I think many people, as I, depending upon where you went to undergrad, there was a requirement for a language where I went to school, and somehow we managed to survive that. And that would bring at least a basic fundamental knowledge of language to the force.

There will have to be some forcing function to, I think, get some traction on this, but it is going to be difficult. The Marine Corps also has a program called Af-Pak [Afghanistan-Pakistan] Hands. Actually it has been taken from, I think, when General McChrystal was ISAF [International Security Assistance Force], and he had a cadre of people, and all the services are participating in the Af-Pak Hands program. In fact, we have three of those officers coming to work for the university as they prepare to deploy, and part of their preparation will be language.

So there is a great interest in it, but my personal opinion is we are struggling to some degree to find the time to meet all the other additional requirements in addition to the language, and it is a work in progress, and there is still much left to do.

Dr. SNYDER. You know, there was a—Dr. Fenner and I can't remember—it was newspaper report, I think, just within the last month that was discussing foreign-language skills, and, you know, I remember I had 2 years of—it took me 2 years of French to get out of high school and 2 years of French to get out of college. You know, if that is what you are talking about, you think, okay, what does that have to do with Iraq? As the article pointed out, I can't remember who was quoted, it said, well, maybe you don't have Arabic skills going into Iraq, but the experience of some of our soldiers was the ability to talk to the allied soldiers was as important, and so the French or Italian or whatever language it was was helpful.

But ramping up that proficiency level, more than just a 2-year jump to get out, may be helpful.

Mr. Sitterly, did you have something?

Mr. SITTERLY. Yes, Dr. Snyder. The language regional expertise and culture issue is one that Secretary Donnelly has asked us to look at very seriously, and we have. In addition to an extremely robust ROTC program, a very robust Air Force Academy language program, we also have just held our second Language Enabled Airmen Program, LEAP program we call it, where we identify—for the very first board, identify cadets coming out of ROTC and the Air Force Academy, and in subsequent boards we intend to look at the Total Force; but we identify those folks that have a language, either capacity, or they already have a proficiency that exists, and then we will take those folks and identify them across their career as LEAP airmen, language enabled airmen, so that we can send them to some sort of intermediate, you know, training courses in order to maintain that proficiency level.

So, in other words, if you bring somebody in, and they have no aptitude, no proficiency, to send them out to Monterey to the Defense Language School to get them up to a proficiency where we could utilize them is a large investment. If they have the capability or show the capacity or the proficiency early, then we can send them perhaps to an overseas assignment or just an immersion program where they can get that proficiency level up to 2–2. And our studies show that if you can get the proficiency on the DLAB [Defense Language Aptitude Battery] score to 2–2, it is a lot easier to maintain that. [Inaudible]

So in our personnel system then, we will have these folks identified. So if we, for instance, have the ability to send a C–130 unit or an airman to Germany or Japan, if we can match their ability to speak German or Japanese to build sort of a, you know, partnership capacity, then we could make that decision, all things being equal. So we put a lot into this program.

Mr. LUTTERLOH. It is a critical issue for us, Mr. Chairman, and it comes with a number of initiatives that we have taken already and a delicate balance in the end.

First off, we have got a strong linguist program for our cryptologists that gets to the level of 2–2 that is excellent. We leverage off that, along with some of the postgraduate school education, the masters programs for our foreign area officers that focus on language and regional expertise in those masters programs. We leverage those two activities to provide targeted just-in-time training and education for deploying strike groups in units going overseas to get them focused on the culture and the region and, to a very minimal degree, some of the language idiosyncrasies.

That said, in general we have increased what we are doing at ROTC with some additional scholarships. I think the class of 2010 out of the Naval Academy had 2 language majors graduate and 10 or 11 with minors in language areas graduate. So our accession mission is also focused on that language education.

Lastly, I would focus on the increased throughput. Both the foreign area officers and just officers in general, through postgraduate school and through our curricula at War College, each class which

is focused on regional areas has been some of the actions we have taken to date.

The balance that I want to talk about has to do with the balance between language education and what we believe is inherent to our force in science, technology, engineering, and math. So we have recently tried to increase our percentages of graduates to 65 percent out of ROTC and the Naval Academy in science, technology, engineering and math. So that is where the balance is going to come, how we balance language against those hard educational curricula.

General MACFARLAND. Sir, I just wanted to add, one of my additional hats is the Defense Language Institute works for me, and so I just wanted to tell you that DLI is doing some really good work in developing new instructional techniques for language training. The language-training detachments that are now global and spread around the world, and the Af-Pak Hands is part of that, is an important way that we are infusing language training into the field, giving units that are deploying the language skills that they need so that there is somebody who is language enabled in each platoon and developing our own language specialists within the force.

We have an LTD, a language training detachment, at Fort Leavenworth, and we offer electives in language to our officers, and every officer is required to study and conduct a regional—have a regional elective. So if you have a language skill, that language elective is also available so that you can do a culture and language study, which is very valuable if you are about to deploy somewhere.

So the Army is right now in the process of developing what we call the Army Cultural and Foreign Language Strategy, and, in fact, DLI teaches culture-based language. And you have to link culture with language instruction, and we think that this is really the model for the future.

How we are going to inject that into our PME for enlisted, warrant officers, civilian, and officer is still being studied though. But we are looking cradle to grave, pre-commissioning through general officer, to ensure that there is a continuum of lifelong learning available for those officers with language skills.

Thank you.

Dr. SNYDER. I think since the last time this subcommittee had a discussion about foreign language, I forget which TV network it was had the embedded reporter, that terrible incident where the contracted interpreter was just flat out wrong in what they were saying and was exasperating for our military officers who thought they were being given false information by the local villagers. And it turned out, in fact, that they were being given—somebody was putting themselves at risk by giving accurate information, but the interpreter didn't pick that up. It just seemed to me that was a piece of film that ought to be part of a training exercise for a long, long time to illustrate this.

General MACFARLAND. It is, sir.

Dr. SNYDER. It is. And then I think it was last week, a couple of weeks, before Thanksgiving, Susan Davis was a host of a breakfast, General Neller, for some of the women Marines—what do you call those teams that go out?

General NELLER. Female engagement teams.

Dr. SNYDER. They were wonderful women, it was great, one of the speakers. But one of the young women brought up her frustration with interpreters, the varied skill levels of the interpreters they have.

And the unfortunate part for me was I can remember I think it was with Jim Saxton, before the events of 2001, was holding classified hearings in this room talking about how we are going to get the language skills we need to keep track of what is going on with all the areas around the world, and I am thinking it must have been a decade now, and we are still having young Marine officers tell us we have got a real problem with having the right language skills. It just seems like it is hampering their activity. But I appreciate the work that you all are doing on it.

I think those are about the things that I wanted to get at. Maybe a few closing comments.

General Neller, you have mentioned enlisted PME, and we did hold the one hearing on enlisted PME, and I have to acknowledge it since Gunnery Sergeant Hector Soto-Rodriguez is sitting right behind you and has been my Marine Fellow for this last year. But I appreciate your mention of it. We focus so much on the in-residence officer PME, but the enlisted PME is so very, very important, and they have some frustrations, too, as you know.

A couple of you acknowledged the presence of Dr. Lorry Fenner, who will not be with the committee after this year, and the great work that she has done, as has the staff.

I also want to recognize Julie Zelnick on my staff, who—you know, you wonder about why do these folks get interested? Ike Skelton made a speech a couple of weeks ago about his fear that we may be having a separation from the civilian world and the military world, and why does a young woman like Julie get involved in this? Well, she has got a brother in the military. His wife is in the military. They actually let them serve together in Iraq because they are lawyers.

Are they both lawyers, Julie?

One lawyer in the family, but they let them serve together in Iraq as a married couple, which is quite unusual. But when you have it that close, then these things become important to you. I also have to mention Julie, because since I am leaving, she still needs a job.

But I appreciate all the work you have done on this. Mr. Skelton will no longer be here, and I will no longer be here. I chose not to run for reelection because I have so many babies at home that need their education.

But this topic is one I know Mr. Wittman is very interested in it. I ask unanimous consent—since I am the only person here, I will give it—that his statement be included as part of record.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Wittman can be found in the Appendix on page 35.]

Dr. SNYDER. But this topic is one that is very important to you, it is very important to the military, it is very important to the Congress. It is not going to go away. And I appreciate all the work that you have done, and it has been an honor to chair the committee.

We are adjourned.

[Whereupon, at 10:37 a.m., the subcommittee was adjourned.]

A P P E N D I X

November 30, 2010

PREPARED STATEMENTS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD

NOVEMBER 30, 2010

Opening Statement of Chairman Vic Snyder
Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations

Hearing on "Continued Engagement: Department of Defense Responses to the House Armed Services Committee April 2010 Report on Professional Military Education"

November 30, 2010

Good morning and welcome to the Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations hearing on the "individual views" of the Secretary of Defense, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and uniformed heads of services on the House Armed Services Committee Report on professional military education (or PME), ***Another Crossroads? Professional Military Education Two Decades After the Goldwater-Nichols Act and the Skelton Panel.***

In April 2010, after more than a year of intense study, hearings, and site visits to all the relevant institutions, the Subcommittee published this report with 39 findings and recommendations. The report examined officer in-residence PME as a critical investment in the most important element of our military -- people. We concluded that the United States cannot afford to be complacent when it comes to producing leaders capable of meeting significant challenges, whether at the tactical, operational, or strategic levels of warfare. Further, as a matter of national security, the country's continuing investment in the PME system must be wisely made.

We also found, that although today's PME system is basically sound, there are areas that need improvement.

The Committee's Report on the *National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal*

Year 2011 required that the Department's most senior leaders provide their views on the subcommittee's PME report. DOD leadership provided their views in September, and indicated they largely agreed with our findings and recommendations. We plan to continue to work with the Department and the military services on PME and help develop ways to strengthen it.

I appreciate that there seemed to be a lot of agreement on most points, but more importantly I'd like to hear from the witnesses about what their bosses disagreed with and why.

For those things that their bosses did agree with that need to be improved, I'd like to have a sense for what the plan is to move forward and how they intend to implement changes.

Finally, I'd like to know if there is anything we missed that needs attention and what can Congress help with.

Before introducing our witnesses, I will turn to Mr. Wittman, our ranking member, for any opening remarks he would like to make.

Statement of Ranking Member Rob Wittman
Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations
House Armed Services Committee

Hearing on Professional Military Education—DOD Senior Leader Views on O&I Subcommittee Report

---

November 30, 2010

Thank you, Chairman Snyder, and good morning to our witnesses.

Last year, this subcommittee undertook an extensive review of the officer professional military education system. While we touched on distance learning and did a separate review on enlisted PME, our primary focus was an exhaustive look at in residence officer professional military education provided by joint and service schools. In the course of the review, we conducted six hearings, held countless meetings and briefings, and visited all PME institutions.

You've had seven months to digest our report and doubtless have come to different conclusions in some cases. Today, it's your turn. You get to tell us what you think of our efforts, and I welcome your candid views. If you disagree with any of our findings or recommendations, please explain

your rationale so we can reconcile the issue. It is very important that areas of disagreement are highlighted; otherwise, we would naturally conclude that our views are in concert and think you are taking action to implement change we recommended. Similarly, I am interested in understanding your plans to implement those findings and recommendations you agree with, and the obstacles you may face.

Our officer PME system sets the standard for professional training for our government civilian professionals and the world's militaries. We must all do what we can to protect and improve this rare and precious tradition—it is no exaggeration to say that the professionally trained officer corps produced by the institutions you represent are an important element to our strong, enduring democracy.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I look forward to hearing from our witnesses.

HOLD UNTIL RELEASED
BY THE COMMITTEE

STATEMENT BY

MR. LERNES J. HEBERT

ACTING DIRECTOR, OFFICER & ENLISTED PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT

OFFICE OF THE DEPUTY UNDER SECRETARY OF DEFENSE

MILITARY PERSONNEL POLICY

REGARDING

PROFESSIONAL MILITARY EDUCATION

BEFORE THE

HOUSE COMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND INVESTIGATIONS

NOVEMBER 30, 2010

Mr. Chairman, Ranking Member Wittman and members of this distinguished Committee – on behalf of the Secretary of Defense and the Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness (USD(P&R), I am providing the Department of Defense's comments on the recommendations and findings of the House Armed Service Committee's report, "Another Crossroads? Professional Military Education Two Decades After the Goldwater-Nichols Act and the Skelton Panel," I thank the Committee for the opportunity to speak about this very important subject. Professional Military Education (PME), as you well know, is essential to the growth of professional men and women in today's military. We take this task very seriously and look at it continuously through the Military Education Coordination Council (MECC) and the accreditation process for Joint Education (PAJE) as is outlined in the Chairman's Instruction 1800.01D Titled: Officer Professional Military Education Policy - more commonly known as the OPMEP.

In reviewing the recommendations and findings in this study and working with the MECC, I can assure you that some of the recommendations have already found their way into our system. For example, in Fiscal Year 2009, my office asked the Director of the Joint Staff to review the JPME I instructor positions to see if these positions could qualify for Joint Duty Credit. This report has been reviewed by the USD(P&R) and sent to the Chairmen and Ranking members of the House and Senate Armed Services Committees. In addition, my office drafted a legislative change to the Fiscal Year 2011 NDAA in the

Omnibus Bill to change the language in §621 providing Joint Duty credit to JPME I instructors on a case by case basis, as is suggested by the Report.

Let me say that the Secretary has full faith and confidence in the Chairman and the Services' ability to provide an outstanding PME program to the men and women serving in our military today. In addition, the Department has been working closely with the Joint Staff and the Services in reviewing all the findings and recommendations of this report. As outlined in our September letter to the Chairmen of the HASC and SASC, the USD(P&R), in conjunction with the Joint Staff and the Services, formed a working group to discuss the 39 recommendations outlined in this study. The Department, in conjunction with the Joint Staff, has established a Senior Leader Group to review the recommendations of the MECC working group with regards to the HASC Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations' PME study.

In general, we agree with the report's basic finding that although the PME system is excellent, the Department needs to improve portions of the current PME system to meet the ever changing needs of the modern profession at arms. In fact, that is one of the critical missions of the MECC.

We believe the report has many valid recommendations, but we are not comfortable at this time going into the details of the recommendations in the report until the Senior Leader Group has had the opportunity to review the MECC working group's suggestions. At that time, the Department will prepare a report that will be staffed through the Office of the Secretary of Defense and forwarded to this committee for

review. The report will outline the way forward on how the Department, Joint Staff, and Services will proceed with the recommendations of the study and it will identify the office or Service that will have primary responsibility for addressing the recommendations. We appreciate your understanding that the Department must fully vet the report and review all the consequences and costs that may be involved in implementing the recommendations. As you know, the Secretary is presently looking at a zero-base budgeting process to see how the Department can reduce its costs while continuing to field the most professional military in the world.

The MECC working group has the right people on it and they are looking at the report in depth. We have every confidence that they will appropriately address the report's recommendations and findings, allowing the Department to issue the guidance necessary to forge a cost effective and educationally sound way forward for PME.

Again, I want to thank you for this opportunity to testify on behalf of the Secretary and the Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness on this topic, and look forward to your questions.

STATEMENT OF

BG WILLIAM C. HIX, USA

**DIRECTOR FOR OPERATIONAL PLANS
AND JOINT FORCE DEVELOPMENT**

BEFORE THE

SUBCOMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND INVESTIGATIONS

OF THE

HOUSE ARMED SERVICES COMMITTEE

PROFESSIONAL MILITARY EDUCATION REPORT RESPONSE HEARING

30 NOVEMBER 2010

Statement of BG WILLIAM C. HIX, USA
House Armed Services Committee
Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations
30 November 2010

Mr. Chairman, Mr. Wittman, Members of the subcommittee, thank you for the opportunity to meet with you and to discuss the subcommittee's report, titled "Another Crossroads? Professional Military Education Two Decades After the Goldwater-Nichols Act and the Skelton Panel." Joint Professional Military Education (JPME) is and will remain an essential pillar in Joint Officer Development, a Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff focus, and we appreciate the subcommittee's continued emphasis on and support for the JPME enterprise.

JPME is the foundation of a joint learning continuum that ensures our Armed Forces are inherently learning organizations. Within that continuum, education provides a broad body of knowledge and develops the habits of study and mind that underpin the ability to think critically in all situations and environments, an essential component of the military professional's expertise in the art and science of war. Our JPME system endeavors to produce: (1) strategically minded officers educated in the profession of arms who possess an intuitive approach to joint warfighting and are able to contribute to informed decision-making on the application of all instruments of national power; (2) critical thinkers who view military affairs in the broadest context and are able to identify system inputs and variables affecting the employment of military power; and (3) senior officers who can develop and execute national military strategies that effectively employ our Armed Forces in concert with other instruments of national power to help achieve the goals of national security strategy and policy.

The Chairman has specific Title 10 responsibility for "formulating policies for coordinating the education and training of members of the armed forces." The Chairman operationalizes this responsibility via Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff Instruction 1800.01D, "Officer Professional Military Education Policy" (OPMEP). In the OPMEP, the Chairman dictates rigorous institutional standards to ensure the proper environment for joint officer peers to achieve acculturation, as well as broad learning areas and objectives that must be addressed within JPME curricula. This foundational policy underpins JPME and provides an educational framework for officers to be immersed in the significant topics and issues associated with "Joint Matters." Furthermore, the Chairman executes this educational responsibility in concert with the Service Chiefs. With their advice and coordination, the Chairman establishes the joint requirements for each JPME institution, particularly at the intermediate

and senior levels of education. The Service Chiefs in turn infuse their component perspectives within school curricula to satisfy both Service and Joint PME requirements. It is within this context that the report's recommendations must be considered.

Specific to the subcommittee's review, we broadly concur with the report's conclusion that the "Professional Military Education System is basically sound" and that there are systemic and institutional areas that require our continued attention. As you are aware, the Joint Staff continues a cross-Departmental effort to analyze the report's recommendations. We expect this analysis to inform decisions this winter. While this effort continues, our preliminary conclusion gives broad endorsement to the report at the macro level. That being said, we believe three specific recommendations require further review.

The recommendation (page 43) that "subsequent revisions of the CJCS' vision for Joint Officer Development should identify how the Joint Qualification System will fulfill the requirements established in the Capstone Concept for Joint Operations (CCJO) for various specific and specialized joint officer competencies" will be addressed with the understanding the CCJO is fundamentally a road map for further concept development. The Chairman's Joint Officer Development vision aims to prepare officers for the CCJO-envisioned force. With much CCJO content moving into joint doctrine, we are on the right path with further work required.

Regarding the recommendation (page 98) that the "... department and CJCS should strengthen the Military Education Coordination Council and MECC working group with the formal inclusion of COCOM representatives at the level of the other participants," our experience shows that combatant command perspectives are valued and actively sought by the MECC community, with the Joint Staff bridging all parties. All applicable policies affecting joint officer development are coordinated directly with the combatant commands, and their inputs have driven changes to joint learning objectives. Further, given their unique roles in education, participation of U.S. Joint Forces Command and U.S. Special Operations Command ensures "customer" voices are heard. In addition, it should be noted that all JPME schools actively survey combatant commands regarding graduate performance.

Regarding the recommendation (page 111) that the "... CJCS and Service Chiefs should establish general criteria or credential requirements for selecting PME directors, commandants, commanders, and presidents to be applied at the Chairman's and Service Chiefs' discretion," we believe each assignment decision is unique to both circumstance and person, although we welcome the criteria outlined by the Skelton panel as a valuable insight to further inform the selection process.

In conjunction with the Office of the Secretary of Defense and the Services, the Joint Staff will continue to work through the report's recommendations in the coming months. Our expectation is the results of this effort will drive changes to policy and procedure, including the Chairman's Officer Professional Military Education Policy (OPMEP). Several issues raised by the report will likely be addressed through normal Military Education Coordination Council avenues and OPMEP revision processes. Our Process of Accreditation for Joint Education -- in which we take robust teams of highly experienced education practitioners from across the JPME community to perform in-depth reviews of school curricula and programs to accredit their status as JPME institutions -- will also give us the opportunity to review many of the issues raised by the report, as well as actions taken in response to those issues.

Congress has been very generous in providing resources to maintain our in-residence programs, as well as to support our robust JPME 1 programs. However, there is one issue for which we would like to solicit the subcommittee's support. The Joint Staff J-7 has submitted a legislative proposal to alter Sections 2154/2156 of Title 10 to provide authority to allow the Joint Forces Staff College (JFSC) to offer an alternative, non-resident JPME Phase II program at off-site locations hosted by the combatant commands and the Joint Staff; this would result in 10 locations total. The proposal was carried in the Senate Armed Services Committee's mark for the 2011 National Defense Authorization Act. First-year cost for the program is estimated at $3.5 million, with additional out-years at $2.7 million each. Our current production of JPME II qualified officers via our in-resident programs is limited to approximately 2,000 annually. This proposal would allow us to increase JPME II output by about 400-500 a year. The satellite campus course would be seminar-based -- an approach proven effective in our other JPME II institutions -- and taught by JFSC-hired and certified instructors. It would have the added benefit of allowing the combatant commands to select who they would like to attend, as well as offering the combatant commands some latitude to tailor portions of the program to meet their specific requirements. With the limited number of in-resident JPME II billets available, this would provide more officers access to rigorous joint education and the opportunity to gain the skills they need to excel in the joint arena.

Conclusion

The dedicated and courageous men and women of our Armed Forces are truly our most vital and cherished strategic resource. Maintaining a highly educated and well-trained force capable of leveraging new ideas is absolutely essential if we are to succeed in the complex and fast-paced environment of current and future military operations. Our forces must

continue to exhibit the highest standards of honor, integrity, competence, and physical and moral courage, as well as dedication to duty and respect for human dignity. We will persist in exploring all available avenues to improve joint education to ensure our forces are equipped with the critical-thinking skills and mental dexterity needed to succeed in all environments. As in all our endeavors, Congress's continued support of joint education has and will enable us to maintain a vibrant and relevant JPME enterprise, and for that we are truly appreciative.

I stand ready to address your questions. Thank you.

NOT FOR PUBLICATION
UNTIL RELEASED BY THE
HOUSE ARMED SERVICES COMMITTEE

STATEMENT OF
BG SEAN B. MACFARLAND
DEPUTY COMMANDANT
ARMY COMMAND AND GENERAL STAFF COLLEGE

BEFORE THE
SUBCOMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND INVESTIGATIONS
OF THE
HOUSE ARMED SERVICES COMMITTEE
ON
ANOTHER CROSSROADS?
PROFESSIONAL MILITARY
EDUCATION TWO DECADES AFTER THE GOLDWATER-NICHOLS
ACT AND THE SKELTON PANEL

NOVEMBER 30, 2010

NOT FOR PUBLICATION
UNTIL RELEASED BY THE
HOUSE ARMED SERVICES COMMITTEE

Statement of
BG Sean MacFarland, USA
Deputy Commanding General, Leader Development and Education
Deputy Commandant, US Army Command and General Staff College

House Armed Services Subcommittee on Investigations and Oversight

Hearing on "Another Crossroads? Professional Military Education Two Decades After the Goldwater-Nichols Act and the Skelton Panel"

November 30, 2010

INTRODUCTION

Chairman Snyder, Representative Wittman, Honorable Members of the Subcommittee, I am BG Sean MacFarland, Deputy Commanding General of the Combined Arms Center. On behalf of the Chief of Staff Army, I would like to thank you for the opportunity to speak with you today about the present status of Professional Military Education in the Army and discuss what we are doing to better prepare leaders to operate with competence and character in the future.

The Army concurs with the Subcommittee's conclusion, the Professional Military Education (PME) system is basically sound, and agrees there are "systemic" and "institutional" areas requiring our continued focus. We recognize the Subcommittee's report provides valuable insights to assist us in our continual assessment of PME and efforts to provide the best educational opportunities to our Soldiers. My comments focus on three areas of interest: Framework for Leader Development, Building a Strategic Bench, and Army PME Institutions.

FRAMEWORK FOR LEADER DEVELOPMENT

First, the Subcommittee's report recommended the Services review their officer development timelines from a holistic perspective to explore innovative avenues to develop their respective officer corps through education, training, and experience. The Army supports this recommendation. We fully recognize Professional Military Education is paramount to an officer's career development. We continuously review our officer Professional Military Education to ensure it remains relevant to our force and national needs.

The strategic environment is growing more complex, increasing the demand on education within innovative and dynamic leader development. The changing environment, nine years of war and the requirement to sustain our readiness causes us to think fundamentally different about the integration of Education, Training, and Experiences for our leaders. We are working diligently to adapt our institutions and policies to achieve better balance of Professional Military Education within leader development. This is particularly evident in our PME approach, as we must account for educational changes in our leader development and personnel management policies. We are driving these changes through development of a comprehensive Army Leader Development Strategy (ALDS) focused on educating the next generation of Army leaders.

The Army's Leader Development Strategy seeks to develop agile, adaptive, and innovative leaders for our Army within a flexible, relevant, and enduring framework of training, education, and experience. In an uncertain and complex future security environment Army leader development must prepare leaders to operate with competence, confidence, and character in ambiguous, frequently changing circumstances. Our leaders deserve the best possible leader development process to enable them to effectively lead our Soldiers and protect and promote our national interests and sustain the public trust. In this era of persistent conflict, we must increase

our efforts to develop each of our leaders, and we must ensure that we are preparing our most talented leaders to lead our Army into the future.

Professional Military Education is essential to an officer's career development. We are shaping the future of our PME system to progressively develop leaders to prevail in the Full Spectrum Operations security environment of the 21st Century. Our Professional Military Education continues to reflect our adaptability to changing conditions and demonstrates the strong emphasis our Army Senior Leaders place on education through agility, adaptability, innovation, and versatility.

Over the past several years, as many recognize, we have become an Army out of balance. Less well known, but increasingly evident, is the fact we are out of balance in developing our leaders for the demands of Full Spectrum Operations. Overemphasizing operational experience at the expense of Professional Military Education and assignment to broadening experiences has contributed to the imbalance.

The Army recognizes it must restore this balance, while simultaneously setting conditions for future success. Our future readiness demands we continue to modernize, adapt our institutions, and transform Soldier and leader development to ensure our campaign capable force is versatile, expeditionary, agile, lethal, sustainable, and interoperable. Adapting our institutions increases efficiency and effectiveness in providing trained and ready forces for combatant commanders. We appreciate your frank evaluation of our schools and educational processes.

Transforming how we train Soldiers and develop agile and adaptive leaders, based on the lessons we continue to learn in Afghanistan and Iraq, is paramount to the success of Full Spectrum Operations in dynamic and complex operating environments.

The Army's Training and Doctrine Command is leading our Human Capital Enterprise. This new initiative will allow synchronization of effort for Army leader development and personnel policies. An important part of the Human Capital Enterprise

mission is to make a concerted effort to restore the balance between the pillars of education, training, and experience.

[Note: References in the report depict the Human Capital Enterprise in a manner implying that this organizational entity is part of the Army's approved structure. At this time, the Human Capital Enterprise is one of four Core Enterprises, which are functioning on a trial basis as part of the Army's transformation efforts. The concept of Core Enterprises has not yet been decided; nor have they been approved or incorporated into the Army's official structure. If approved, the current intent is for the appropriate Assistant Secretary of the Army to lead their functional Core Enterprise with support from the Army Staff and Army Commands.]

BUILDING A STRATEGIC BENCH

Second, the Subcommittee's report recommended the Services carefully review and further develop relevant processes for identifying and cultivating strategists. The Army's challenge is to grow adaptive innovative leaders who learn faster, understand better, and successfully handle uncertainty. Our leaders must be able to effectively work with our Joint, Interagency, Intergovernmental, and Multinational teammates. We must continually challenge our leaders with a competitive learning environment, and it is in this environment where we must prevail. PME alone is no longer adequate. We have to recognize the officers with high potential and provide them with challenging experiences. To do this, the Army offers multiple broadening opportunities outside the realm of our traditional PME to educate our officers throughout their career timeline. These experiences are designed to develop a wider range of knowledge and skills; augment understanding of the spectrum of military missions; promote application of specialized skills; and expand awareness of other agencies, organizations, and environments. I would like to highlight a few of these broadening programs.

Through the Advance Civil Schooling (ACS) Program, the Army resources up to 412 fully funded resident degree programs placing officers into positions requiring a

graduate or doctoral level degree. The ACS program also contributes to an inventory of officers who possess requisite academic credentials and technical skills to meet existing force structure requirements, as well as meeting future capabilities envisaged by the Army Educational Requirements System (AERS). Additionally, ACS educates officers about emerging technologies, who can then transform relevant information from the laboratory to real world applications on the battlefield.

Since 2006 we have offered the Expanded Graduate School Program (EGSP) for up to 600 officers per year. We identify officers prior to commissioning who we believe have the potential for long and productive service. At the 10-12 year mark in their career, selected officers have the opportunity to attend a US civilian graduate school and are encouraged to study an approved discipline to enhance the competencies required in an expeditionary Army--emphasizing cultural awareness, regional knowledge, foreign language, governance, diplomacy, national security, or social sciences to reinforce operational skills.

The Joint Chiefs of Staff/Office of the Secretary of Defense (JCS/OSD) Internship is another great opportunity for our young captains with outstanding potential for service to experience the Joint environment early in their career. They complete a three-phase, degree-producing program. Completion of Phase One results in a Master's Degree in Policy Management from Georgetown University's Public Policy Institute. Phase Two is a one-year internship within a single office in the Joint Staff or the Office of the Secretary of Defense. Phase Three is a one-year internship on the Army Staff. Assignments to Army Staff positions are based upon unique skills acquired during both of the previous phases of the program. Like the Joint Staff and OSD Staff, the Army Staff places interns into demanding roles as staff officers, to leverage their knowledge base to represent the Army within the Pentagon and the Department of Defense.

The Army Congressional Fellowship Program (ACFP) educates selected Army captains and civilians in all aspects of congressional activities, emphasizing those matters regarding the Department of Defense (DOD). A three-year program, ACFP

includes a master's degree in legislative affairs at George Washington University, service on the staff of a Member of Congress, and utilization on the Army or Joint Staff in a legislative liaison duty position. The program provides insights into the dimensions and complexities of congressional responsibilities and their relationship to the total process of government. In the past year we have increased ACFP opportunities from 12 to 24.

The Functional Area (FA) 59, Strategist career field is another component for building our strategic bench. The Army selects most strategists between year seven and 14 of commissioned service and educates them with Advanced Civilian Schooling, Intermediate Level Education, the on-line Defense Strategy Course, and the resident Basic Strategic Arts Program. FA59 utilizes the School of Advanced Military Studies and Civilian Fellowships to develop and strengthen core competencies. After these educational opportunities the strategists serve in a variety of headquarters from division to combatant command level. Senior FA59s (COL-BG) will then work within the Interagency, Office of the Secretary of Defense, Army and the Joint Staff. In these positions, they participate in campaign planning, policy development and work with interagency partners on a wide variety of critical national security issues. A concern raised by the Committee was the lack of viability in promotion prospects for senior FA59s. This trend is shifting as the second FA59 officer has recently been nominated for promotion to General Officer.

Established in 2009, the Command and General Staff College (CGSC) Interagency Fellowship Program is another unique opportunity to help build our strategic bench. This program offers Army majors a greater understanding of the role of our interagency partners. They have the opportunity to gain personal knowledge about the capabilities, missions, procedures, and requirements of Federal departments, agencies, and Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs) through participation in a 9-12 month fellowship. We currently have 28 majors working with 13 agencies. This program has also allowed interagency organizations to send their employees to CGSC, thus enhancing Intermediate Level Education (ILE).

The Advanced Military Studies Program (AMSP) is another critical component of our efforts to develop officers as operational planners. Majors may apply while attending Intermediate Level Education or may be nominated from field units after having completed their Intermediate Level Education course. Each candidate undergoes a rigorous selection process. AMSP educates leaders to be critical thinkers and operational planners by teaching officers to understand the theory of operational art, to define security problems using design methodology, to understand and evaluate the strategic context for operational art, to understand the evolution of operational art through history, and to be competent at preparing military plans using both the Joint Operation Planning Process and the Army Military Decision Making Process. The Army recognized the growing need for such planners in 2008, and increased the student population from 68 to 108 per year.

The Command and General Staff College also offers a senior level program for officers in the rank of LTC-COL. The Advanced Operational Art Studies Fellowship (AOASF) focuses on the art of command and leadership for national and theater–strategic strategy development and campaign planning. AOASF seeks to educate the future leaders of our Armed Forces, our Allies, and the Inter-Agency at the graduate level to be agile and adaptive leaders who think critically at the strategic level to solve complex, ambiguous problems.

On behalf of the Chief of Staff of the Army, the Army War College administers a mature and competitive Senior Service Fellowship program designed to broaden up to 75 senior officers in a wide variety of disciplines at 35 prestigious educational, governmental, and non-governmental institutions. This program provides the Army with a cohort of senior leaders possessing a broad range of competencies and experiences to better meet the demands of the strategic and institutional environments of the 21st Century.

Other broadening opportunities for senior leaders include fellowships at the Brookings Institute; the Council of Foreign Relations; and the Harvard University, Weatherhead Center for International Affairs. Additionally, there are Regional Fellowships, including the Asia-Pacific Center of Security Studies; the George C. Marshall Center; and the State Department Planning and Policy Fellowship. Other Fellowships are conducted at the White House, Congress, Arroyo Center, and RAND.

The focal point of Army General Officer Training is the Army Strategic Leadership Development Program (ASLDP). This program supports Army General Officer development by requiring attendance at the Basic, Intermediate, Advanced and Senior courses as officers are promoted from Brigadier to Lieutenant General. Other courses cover Army Senior Leader Communication, Force Integration, Battle Command, Legal, Senior Commander, National Security Studies, National and International Security, Defense Policy, Senior Joint Information Operations, National Security Decision Making, Language and Cultural Awareness and Individual Terrorism Awareness.

The Army War College also offers several short courses for general/flag officers including: Combined/Joint Force Land Component Commander Course (C/JFLCC), Adjutant's General National Security Seminar (AGNSS), and Senior Reserve Component Officers' Course (SRCOC). The Army War College also supports the Joint Flag Officer Warfighting Course (JFOWC) hosted by Air University.

PROFESSIONAL MILITARY EDUCATION INSTITUTIONS

Finally, the quality of our Professional Military Education Institutions is important to us as it directly influences the education our Soldiers receive. The Subcommittee's report referenced a number of valid concerns I would like to address.

The Subcommittee's report referenced a continuing debate concerning how the school presidents, commanders, commandants, and directors should be selected and how long they should remain in their positions. The Army takes very seriously both the professional and academic credentials of its PME leaders. The Army has specific

requirements for the leadership positions at both CGSC and US Army War College (USAWC). These requirements are codified into the manning documents at the Human Resources Command.

The Commandant, USAWC should possess an extensive background in both professional and academic domains. The professional background should include extensive experience at the theater and strategic levels. Academically, Commandants should possess, at a minimum, a masters degree and preferably a terminal degree in a discipline appropriate to Senior Level College curriculum. Prior teaching experience, especially at the graduate level or within the JPME educational system is a decided plus. As befits a professional development school, leadership capabilities of the Commandant should be a paramount consideration in selection.

The ideal candidate for the Dean of Academics, USAWC would be an Army colonel who has commanded at the battalion level or higher, has extensive professional experience at the operational or strategic level, is a Senior Level College graduate and possesses a terminal degree in a discipline relevant to the Army War College academic program. Alternatively, a civilian candidate should have a terminal degree in an appropriate discipline and military or civilian experience at the strategic level. In either case, teaching experience, particularly at the graduate level or within the JPME system is highly desired. Because ideal conditions cannot always be met and because war colleges are professional development institutions, preference should be given to professional experiences. Department chairs should have qualifications similar to the Dean of Academics.

At CGSC, school directors must be a colonel or civilian equivalent, be graduates of senior level colleges, hold masters degrees, have leadership experience in the operational environment, and have commanded battalions or higher. Their civilian counterparts must have terminal degrees, be considered subject matter experts in their chosen area of expertise, have leadership experience, and have a thorough understanding of Army structure and organization. The civilian Dean of Academics at

CGSC holds a terminal degree and has the requisite experience and background commensurate with the position. Having a terminal degree is extremely important for the Dean of Academics because he is responsible for faculty and curriculum. In addition, he provides subject matter expertise to other institutions that comprise the Army's Leader Development and Education (LD&E) enterprise. Under the Dean's purview, he is responsible for quality assurance, accreditation, faculty development, registrar functions, graduate degree programs, the library, the captains career course, academic chairs, digital leader development center, and academic operations.

The quality of the faculty at our PME institutions is extremely important to us. The report raised a concern about the hiring and retaining of Title 10 civilian professors. We have found hiring under Title 10 to be a real strength. The law offers the ability to identify specific faculty requirements, provides flexibility in hiring searches, and allows for competitive salary and benefits. Since all faculty are on term appointments requiring review at regular intervals, the Title 10 process allows CGSC and USAWC greater flexibility to retain the best faculty and the ability to release those who may not meet the rigorous standards.

An observation in the report inferred that CGSC used contracted faculty that had limited operational experience. Firstly, all faculty at CGSC are government employees, the vast majority hired as Title X, who go through a rigorous screening process. Secondly, the majority of the civilian faculty members at CGSC are retired military officers from all services, many of whom have extensive operational experience. Consequently, they possess a thorough knowledge of the Department of Defense and their particular service. However, recent operational experience is not a sufficient criterion for teaching at CGSC. This is a graduate school which employs an adult learning model highlighted by facilitated discussion in the classroom. The civilian faculty at CGSC is dedicated to becoming expert teachers and facilitators as well as subject matter experts and scholars in their chosen fields. It is the strong belief of the leadership at CGSC a mix of military and civilian faculty best achieves the graduate

level educational goals of the College. Further, the augmentation of guest speakers provides operational currency as needed throughout the course.

Of course we would like to have a higher percentage of military faculty at ILE, but the requirements of the operational force have strained our ability to fill the generating force. The current ratio of 70 percent civilian and 30 percent military is a result of not having the requisite number of military faculty assigned to CGSC. A balance closer to 50% would allow us to better develop both the rotational military faculty and maintain closer ties to the operating force. As the operational environment changes, the availability of qualified military officers to teach at CGSC should improve; however, CGSC will not lower faculty standards to accept any military officer.

The quality of the facilities is an essential element of a quality education. The Army has invested in providing an optimum environment for our officers to learn. To accommodate the increase in International Fellows/Foreign Military Officers from 40 to 80 by AY2013, the Army War College is expanding from 20 to 24 classrooms, all of which will have extensive educational and informational technology. Office space will be increased to accommodate additional faculty. Both projects will be complete in June 2011. This expansion project also will reduce the number of students per seminar from 17 to 16, bringing it more in line with the adult learning model.

The CGSC Lewis and Clark Center is a state of the art learning center. It is four floors high, with 96 classrooms each configured with a horseshoe-shape of 16 workstations and an instructor station, white boards, plasma screens, video-teleconference capability, and cameras. Eisenhower Auditorium also features state-of-the art technology and holds over 2,000 people.

CGSC views the integration of technology as critical to learning. The College has acquired and extensively leveraged appropriate technologies sufficient to enable the conduct of operational and tactical planning singularly or in concert with other units,

service centers, and schools using battle command systems available in the field. Technology is fundamental to CGSC's mission and is a real strength of the institution.

CLOSING

We fully recognize and accept that we must continually adapt our institutions and policies to achieve a better balance of Professional Military Education as a part of the Army Leader Development Strategy. Today, the Army's challenge is to develop a sustainable learning environment that is essential to support operational adaptability. We are shaping the future of our PME system to better develop the leader characteristics our Expeditionary Army requires of its officers to lead Full Spectrum Operations in an era of persistent conflict. We must continue to prepare our leaders to be adaptive and open minded in framing the problems they will face, agile in considering new ideas, and grounded in the values to which our Nation aspires.

We look forward to continuing to work with the Subcommittee on these issues and related PME issues you have identified for further study. We recognize that your continued support of Professional Military Education programs is vital to the sustained health of our leader development and the security of our Nation. Furthermore, your continued concern and support of our Soldiers, Families, Civilians and Veterans who serve our great Nation is greatly appreciated.

NOT FOR PUBLICATION
UNTIL RELEASED BY THE
HOUSE ARMED SERVICES COMMITTEE

STATEMENT OF

MR. SCOTT LUTTERLOH

DIRECTOR, TRAINING AND EDUCATION DIVISION

BEFORE THE

SUBCOMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND INVESTIGATIONS

OF THE

HOUSE ARMED SERVICES COMMITTEE

ON

ANOTHER CROSSROADS?

PROFESSIONAL MILITARY

EDUCATION TWO DECADES AFTER THE GOLDWATER-NICHOLS

ACT AND THE SKELTON PANEL

NOVEMBER 30, 2010

NOT FOR PUBLICATION
UNTIL RELEASED BY THE
HOUSE ARMED SERVICES COMMITTEE

Chairman Snyder, Representative Wittman, and distinguished members of the Oversight and Investigations Subcommittee, thank you the opportunity to discuss Navy's views on the Committee's April 2010 report, *Another Crossroads? Professional Military Education Two Decades after the Goldwater-Nichols Act and the Skelton Panel.*

We appreciate the Subcommittees efforts in conducting such a comprehensive assessment of Professional Military Education (PME) since enactment of Goldwater-Nichols. The major findings are accurate in identifying the fundamental issues warranting critical deliberation as we continue in our commitment to improve PME and the professional development of the officer corps. We concur with the Subcommittee's assessment that, while the PME system is basically sound, there are areas that need improvement. We are engaged with the Joint Staff and other Services in a deliberate, collaborative assessment to evaluate recommendations to improve officer in-resident PME. Our approach is to seek solutions that enable development of a broad portfolio of core capabilities to support vital interests, realized by well-prepared, highly-motivated and ably-led professionals.

Navy places significant value on PME as we develop and enable resilient and adaptable leaders to meet challenges at the tactical, operational, and strategic levels of war. Naval War College, renowned for its PME program, has once again received accreditation through the Process for Accreditation of Joint Education (PAJE), for Joint Professional Military Education (JPME) Phase I, and first-time accreditation for JPME Phase II. Navy continues to emphasize PME as we provide unique and complementary maritime war-fighting skills to joint and combined force commanders. We support these commanders with operational forces led by commanding officers who have completed PME.

In response to the need for increased joint and service-specific subject matter to be taught earlier in an officer's career, Navy has established a career continuum of PME. We have a sequenced continuum of learning that provides relevant education aligned to career progression spanning E-1 through O-8, with a goal of providing Navy's Total Force with a standardized, comprehensive understanding of the Navy and its war-fighting capabilities. PME, at the primary, intermediate, senior, and flag levels, involves developing habits of thought and key attributes such as critical thinking, effective communication, and risk management.

We concur with the report's observation that, while PME is a factor in cultivating strategists, it is not the primary means for developing future strategic decision-makers. As noted, Navy has a relatively advanced process for cultivating strategists. We are actively engaged in a review of how we develop our senior leaders, as we work to further enhance development and tracking of strategists, through improvements to Navy's politico-military education, utilization and community sponsorship program.

Competing demand for time in the career track of officers of the Unrestricted Line (URL) remains a primary challenge. We continually review officer development timelines to explore innovative avenues to provide increased opportunities for education, training and experience. Recently, we implemented new approaches to officer development through introduction of specialty career paths for URL officers, which are not typically available within the warfare enterprises. These specialty career paths, including Antiterrorism/Force Protection, Missile Defense, Strategic Sealift, Operations Analysis, Operational Planner and Training Management, allow Navy to better integrate training, education and experience tours focused on specialty areas, while officers continue to serve in their warfare communities. Our executive

officer/commanding officer (XO/CO) fleet-up program, by which prospective CO's are first assigned to serve as XO of the ship or squadron they will ultimately command, capitalizes on direct experience received within a particular command, and captures valuable career path time for fulfilling other developmental assignments, including education. We are continuing to explore other potential innovative opportunities.

We concur with the report's observation that Naval War College's detailed appointment letters provide well-defined expectations related to appointment renewals and performance appraisals, and serve as positive examples for use by the other services to recruit and sustain quality faculty. We are currently evaluating the report's recommendation that Navy consider instituting a quality board process for selection of in-resident PME students, by evaluating our process of screening top performing officers for eligibility to attend service colleges. This recommendation was an agenda item before the Vice Chief of Naval Operations-chaired Advanced Education Review Board (AERB) last month. Navy has appointed a cross-functional working group to evaluate the current selection board processes for JPME in-residence education. Results of the group's evaluation will be presented to the AERB in April 2011.

Navy takes a balanced approach to professional education that views operational competency and primacy of command as the key professional measures for Naval Officers. PME has been instrumental in developing a highly educated and more effective leader. We value the flexibility provided by the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, which permits Navy to manage the content, quality and conduct of our PME Continuum.

Thank you again for your strong support of military members and their families and for your leadership in the professional development of the Navy Total Force.

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE

PRESENTATION TO THE COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES
SUBCOMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND INVESTIGATIONS
UNITED STATES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

SUBJECT: REVIEW OF THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES
REPORT ON PROFESSIONAL MILITARY EDUCATION

STATEMENT OF: MR. DANIEL R. SITTERLY
DIRECTOR OF FORCE DEVELOPMENT
UNITED STATES AIR FORCE

NOVEMBER 30, 2010

NOT FOR PUBLICATION UNTIL RELEASED BY
THE COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES
UNITED STATES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Introduction

The Chief of Staff of the Air Force (CSAF) concurs with the general tenets of the House Armed Services Committee report that the "Professional Military Education system is still basically sound" but with systemic and institutional areas that require our heightened focus and effort to improve. We strongly support the idea that education must be relevant to the student and the Services as well as the Department of Defense. To maintain a stronger correlation among education, officer development, and organizational requirements, the Air Force will ensure Professional Military Education (PME) can anticipate and adapt to current and future challenges, not the least of which is meeting the increasing need for additional joint and Service-specific subject matter taught earlier in an officers' career, and equipping officers with the developmental joint education they need before they are placed into joint assignments.

Joint PME

Falling under the broad genre of system issues, we concur with the need to address the diminished relationship between Joint PME and joint duty assignments. The Air Force is a force provider and, as such, endeavors to meet the requirements detailed in both DoD and joint policy and directives. Addressing this issue requires both the individual and combined efforts of the Services. This same effort will be expended to address two related areas of concern: The preparatory value of PME and tensions among career development, and joint-service requirements and PME.

Developing Strategists

Despite several subcommittee findings concerning our failure to identify and cultivate strategic thinkers, we are actively developing and implementing programs to grow strategists who think both broadly and critically. Combined with a strong Fellowship program, we have recently added a number of advanced academic degree opportunities in history, political science, international relations,

economics, and philosophy to our portfolio. These new degrees are being earned at some of the nation's most prestigious universities and a number are reserved for only our captains. Offering these opportunities earlier in our officers' careers will help the Air Force develop leaders better prepared to meet current and emerging needs. Beyond that, a complete transformation of the company grade officer-level PME programs was just completed, offering an expanded introduction to the Service-specific doctrine in the Air and Space Basic Course, and a dramatically enhanced leadership course that includes joint and staff training at the Squadron Officer School. Through an increased focus on critical thinking at junior levels, we are developing an officer corps that is both capable of, and empowered to solve the problems they will encounter throughout their careers. They are learning and practicing strategic thinking earlier than in the past.

Those that stand out in their strategic-thinking capability have additional opportunities for development in the advanced-learning programs for exceptional students that we have created at both Air Command and Staff College and Air War College. Additionally, we have expanded the student throughput at our School of Advanced Air and Space Studies. We will continue to mentor and track these officers to ensure that their talents and additional specialized developmental education are put to good use in support of the Department's wide array of missions. Additionally, we are in the process of adding a doctoral program for senior development in the School of Advanced Air and Space Studies to extend exceptional students' intellectual growth beyond their residence experience. We are also working to ensure that our assignment policies reinforce the relationship between Joint PME and joint duty assignments, in order to provide officers who are grounded in the complexities of joint, coalition and multinational operations and, therefore, better prepared to overcome the unexpected challenges they will face.

Content and Delivery

Although the Air Force can address issues related to the Process for Accreditation of Joint Education (e.g., reviewing our selection process), the combined Services may need to consider changes in the policy governing student-mix ratios due to faculty manning as a result of operations tempo and end strength. Another issue falling under the heading of content and delivery is our continuing use of pass/fail systems. The Air Force concurs with the report's finding that these systems do not necessarily detract from the rigor of academic programs; however, the Air Force believes Air University's current online distance learning program serves as the model for design, allowing us to evolve beyond the more simplistic correspondence-course approaches of the past. We also concur with the report's finding that we have a need to address faculty and resource concerns at our institutions. Therefore, we are reviewing policies regarding our hiring practices, job advancement and academic freedom, as well as copyright and intellectual property concerns.

Conclusion

The Air Force has made significant advances in the past two years toward its goal of leading the Services in its approach to developmental education. We have "upped our game" with a new distance learning academic/PME program, the complete transformation of company-grade officer Professional Military Education, new advanced courses within the Air Command and Staff College and Air War College, and expanded enrollment and progress toward a doctoral program in the School of Advanced Air and Space Studies. These efforts, combined with conducive personnel policy and developmental opportunities allow us to continue forging the synergistic relationship between Air Force training, experience, and education. We're confident we can continue to produce the officers our nation needs, and deliver them to their assignments fully trained, equipped and ready to excel.

NOT FOR PUBLICATION UNTIL
RELEASED BY THE
HOUSE ARMED SERVICE COMMITTEE

STATEMENT OF

MAJOR GENERAL ROBERT NELLER

COMMANDING GENERAL

EDUCATION COMMAND, QUANTICO, VA

BEFORE THE

SUBCOMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND INVESTIGATIONS

OF THE

HOUSE ARMED SERVICES COMMITTEE

CONCERNING

ANOTHER CROSSROADS? PROFESSIONAL MILITARY EDUCATION TWO DECADES AFTER THE GOLDWATER-NICHOLS ACT AND THE SKELTON PANEL.

ON

NOVEMBER 30, 2010

NOT FOR PUBLICATION UNTIL
RELEASED BY THE
HOUSE ARMED SERVICE COMMITTEE

Chairman Snyder, Ranking Member Wittman, distinguished sub-committee members. Good morning. Thank you for permitting me to discuss the Marine Corps' views on *Another Crossroads? Professional Military Education Two Decades after the Goldwater-Nichols Act and the Skelton Panel.*

The Marine Corps deeply appreciates the extensive research, analysis, and documentation contained in the report. The work of the subcommittee provided a thorough assessment of the status of Professional Military Education (PME) and more importantly, provided sound recommendations on a variety of issues that will improve our educational programs. We have carefully reviewed the report and are already at work implementing many of the recommendations. Additionally, we are working closely with the Joint Staff and other services to ensure a coordinated approach as we examine each issue.

The Marine Corps, and Marine Corps University (MCU) in particular, is constantly reviewing and revising PME programs to ensure we meet the needs of the operating forces and prepare our leaders for the complex environments in which they will operate. Over the past few years, we have strengthened the faculty and staff of our schools and colleges and continually reviewed our curricula for relevance. Additionally, we have planned infrastructure improvements and technology enhancements that will dramatically improve the learning environment for our students. While we continue to make our quality resident officer programs even better, our current emphasis is the improvement of our enlisted PME programs. We ask an unbelievable amount from our enlisted leaders and they deserve the same quality education as our officers. We are actively revising our enlisted curricula to ensure relevance at all levels from corporals to senior enlisted leaders. Online distance education modules are being developed to both better reach Marines participating in PME programs, and to provide a higher quality

educational experience. These distance programs will ultimately serve as a prerequisite for resident courses. This will allow the resident programs to focus on the application of warfighting skills, critical thinking, and communication skills. The recent implementation of our Senior Enlisted PME Course fills a critical void in the enlisted PME continuum by enhancing the knowledge of our senior leaders to allow them to more effectively serve as senior advisors. As noted in the *Issues for Further Study* section of the report, progress has been made but much work remains to fully prepare our enlisted leaders.

Last month, General Amos published his Commandant's Planning Guidance identifying professional military education as one of his top priorities. His guidance directs the development of plans to increase the number of Marines attending resident officer and enlisted education programs and to continue to develop MCU into a world-class institution. We are in the process of developing options to increase attendance in our programs without sacrificing quality or desired learning outcomes. World-class status is achieved through world-class faculty, world-class students, world-class curricula, and world-class facilities and resources. Although work remains, as noted earlier, we have made substantial progress in strengthening faculty, students, and curricula. We are also on track to make significant progress in facilities. For example, over $120M in military construction is programmed over the next three years for our educational facilities. I am also pleased to report that the Expeditionary Warfare School Distributed Education Network (EDEN), an item of interest during a subcommittee visit, is now fully funded and will be operational as soon as possible. Our institutional commitment toward PME, coupled with the Commandant's commitment to achieve world-class status, illustrate the Marine Corps is totally dedicated to educating our future leaders. The Commandant's Planning

Guidance and the subcommittee report complement each other and provide a good roadmap to improve our already strong PME programs.

I will address some of the key recommendations of the subcommittee's report, particularly those that relate directly to the Marine Corps.

The report correctly identifies the need to clarify the role of education in preparing officers for joint duty assignments. We agree that PME, and Joint PME (JPME) in particular, plays an important role in preparing officers for these challenging joint assignments. We further believe that a combination of training and education is needed to fully prepare officers. Surveys of supervisors of our graduates indicate that our programs are meeting this goal. In fact, for the past two years, 98% of the supervisors indicated that Command and Staff graduates are prepared for joint assignments, while 100% of supervisors indicated that MCWAR graduates are prepared for joint assignments. Surveys of the graduates of both programs were equally positive. Additionally, our educational programs provide comprehensive coverage of the competencies identified in the report as appropriate for educational venues in the development of joint staff officers. Service capabilities, the ability to conduct research, critical thinking, problem solving, and effective communication skills are emphasized in all our colleges and schools. Over the past five years, MCU has continually raised the bar for effective communications. Most recently, MCU identified "Strengthening Leadership through Enhancement of Communication Skills" as a key effort for student learning and for submission as a component for regional accreditation. Under this program, MCU has established a Leadership Communication Skills Center, standardized assessments, and provided individualized communication skills assistance to numerous students. We view these skills as crucial for all officers, regardless of a particular billet assignment.

We agree that development of officers must be approached in a holistic fashion. Education is a critical component, but varied assignments, unit training, and individual developmental opportunities all ultimately contribute to the maturation of our leaders. MCU works closely with Manpower and Reserve Affairs to ensure PME programs are aligned with those of the manpower community. Ongoing planning to substantially increase attendance at officer resident PME programs will require close coordination with manpower to meet the Commandant's guidance, while maintaining adequate levels of manning in our operating forces. As suggested in the committee report, we are investigating innovative approaches to deliver PME in conjunction with operational assignments and other developmental opportunities.

The report correctly notes that the Marine Corps is the only service that does not have a formal program that allows Marines to pursue a doctoral degree. The Marine Corps is currently conducting a comprehensive education study to identify positions requiring specific educational degrees. This study will validate all existing structure positions, but more importantly, will identify opportunities for Marines to pursue degrees in a wide variety of disciplines. Doctoral degrees will be a key component of this study. MCU has proposed to the institution a program whereby selected Marines can attend civilian institutions to obtain a doctoral degree. Under this proposal, the officer will spend 18-24 months at a civilian institution to complete course work and comprehensive examinations, and then will be assigned as teaching faculty at MCU while completing his or her dissertation. The program will benefit the officer and the Marine Corps. We value the liberal arts education provided by civilian institutions and, as noted in the report, do not view internal-administered programs as substitutes for these developmental opportunities.

We concur with the report's observation that strategists are developed through a combination of experience and education. We believe that our PME programs are properly

constructed to provide a thorough understanding of the principles of the strategic level of war and the complexities of developing well-reasoned strategy. In particular, our School of Advanced Warfighting provides a world-class curriculum for complex problem solving and planning and the Marine Corps War College is focused on development of strategic leaders. The previously mentioned graduate education study will identify positions that will provide unique developmental opportunities for Marines of all ranks. Additionally, we recently conducted a pilot Senior Planners Course for Colonels to hone their planning skills as they assume key positions in the operating forces. The results of the pilot were very positive and we plan to continue to offer the course to better prepare many of our senior leaders.

We understand the rationale of the report's recommendation that general criteria or credential requirements should be developed for leaders of PME institutions. While these would be useful in vetting candidates, we believe that demonstrated leadership performance should be the basis for selection of individuals to lead our PME institutions. Academic credentials are important, but the ability to lead large complex organizations, completion of PME at each level, and a concern for properly educating leaders are the key factors in selecting these leaders.

We appreciate the support of the subcommittee and we will review the associated recommendation to amend the 2007 legislation so as not to preclude the possibility of Joint Duty Assignment credit for non-host faculty at JPME I institutions. This is an important issue for our intermediate level service institutions as we seek to attract the most qualified personnel as faculty. The window of opportunity, however, is narrow for these officers as they must balance command, staff assignments, professional developmental opportunities, and joint duty assignments. These faculty members continually work joint matters such as national security strategy, campaigning, joint planning processes, joint capabilities, and the integration of service

capabilities. Even though officers may self-nominate for the awarding of joint credit, this is far from a guarantee. We wholeheartedly agree with the subcommittee's recommendation to review the provisions of faculty hiring under Title 10 authority. The current statute has served us very well as we have been able to hire exceptional faculty for our 10-month officer PME programs. As mentioned previously, our enlisted leaders deserve the same quality educational experience. We view this as a key step in improving our enlisted programs and more closely aligning them with officer PME.

In summary, your Marine Corps Professional Military Education programs are strong and are producing leaders who are competent, able to think critically, and capable of solving complex problems. We appreciate the work of the subcommittee and believe the recommendations contained in the report will make our programs even stronger.

○