

GAO

AD-A253 956



March 1991

United States General Accounting Office

Briefing Report to the Chairman, Panel
on Military Education, Committee on
Armed Services, House of
Representatives

ARMY

Status of
Recommendations on
Officers' Professional
Military Education



92-21884



National Security and
International Affairs Division

B-242181

March 21, 1991

The Honorable Ike Skelton
Chairman, Panel on Military Education
Committee on Armed Services
House of Representatives

Dear Mr. Chairman:


In response to your request, we examined several Department of Defense (DOD) professional military education schools' implementation of selected Phase I recommendations contained in the April 1989 report of the Panel on Military Education. These recommendations were developed to assist DOD in improving its officer professional military education programs. This report deals with the U.S. Army schools located at Fort Leavenworth, Kansas, and Carlisle Barracks, Pennsylvania. The former is called the Army Command and General Staff College (intermediate school) while the latter is the Army War College (senior school).

As agreed with your Office, we focused our review on the schools' implementation of 31 and 32 selected recommendations, respectively, contained in the Panel report that apply to the two schools.

Background

A primary objective of the Goldwater-Nichols Reorganization Act of 1986 is to strengthen combined and joint operations of the various military services. To fulfill this objective, the House Armed Services Committee established the Panel on Military Education in November 1987 to report its findings and recommendations regarding the ability of DOD to develop joint specialty officers through its professional military education systems.

The Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff, established policies, programs, guidelines, and procedures for coordinating, among other things, the joint professional military education of members of the U.S. armed forces. This guidance is contained in the Military Education Policy Document that was issued in May 1990. Military departments are required to incorporate this guidance into their own professional military education systems. In addition, joint professional military education schools exist which, by law, are joint in their mission and orientation.



When the Panel reported its findings and recommendations in April 1989, it envisioned that joint education would be an integral part of professional military education and would be implemented in two phases. Phase I would be taught at the intermediate level service schools attended by officers primarily at the rank of major/lieutenant commander or at the senior level service schools attended by officers primarily at the rank of lieutenant colonel/commander and colonel/captain ranks. Phase II, taught at the Armed Forces Staff College in Norfolk, Virginia, would complement Phase I and officers would usually attend it after completing Phase I.

The Army offers Phase I professional military education at both its intermediate and senior schools. The intermediate school has 309 faculty members and 1,280 students for academic year 1990-91. The senior school has 77 teaching faculty members and 287 students for the same year. The academic year started in August 1990 and is scheduled to end in June 1991.

Results in Brief

Out of 31 recommendations, the intermediate school reports that actions have been taken to either implement or partially implement 29. The school has no plans to implement the remaining two recommendations. One recommends performing a feasibility study to establish a faculty exchange program with the service academies. Intermediate school officials told us that they did not see any advantages to this type of exchange program.

The other deals with using the officers' performance (efficiency) reports rather than training reports to present a broader measure of the officers' entire performance. The school is required by the Army Department to use training reports when measuring students' achievement of course objectives. They also stated that training reports ultimately become a permanent part of the officers' records.

Out of 32 recommendations, the senior school reports that actions have been taken to implement or partially implement 29. Like the intermediate school, the senior school has not implemented the two recommendations discussed above, and does not plan to establish a distinguished graduate program to rank each student. Officials stated that students are judged against established standards and not each other. Students are taught to cooperate and work to achieve a common objective.

Appendix I presents the recommendations along with each school's characterization of their status. It also provides additional details on the actions taken by the intermediate and senior schools.

Scope and Methodology

We focused on the Panel recommendations concerning Phase I professional military education and selected the recommendations for which the schools are either directly responsible or play a significant supporting role in their implementation. We interviewed appropriate officials at both schools, asked them to characterize the status of each recommendation, and examined pertinent supporting documents.

In each case where we were told that officials had implemented or partially implemented a recommendation, we reviewed and analyzed the supporting documentation used in making their characterization. In addition, we examined the methodology used to produce supporting data. Where additional action was still required, we met with school officials to discuss future plans. We obtained written documents to support those plans, whenever possible. In those cases where school officials told us that they had not taken any action in response to a Panel recommendation, we interviewed appropriate officials to obtain their reasons for non-implementation.

DTIC QUALITY INSPECTED 8

We performed our review from June through October 1990 in accordance with generally accepted government auditing standards.

We did not obtain formal comments from the U.S. Army. However, we discussed a draft of this report with the deputy commandant of the intermediate school and the commandant of the senior school as well as other officials. We considered their comments in finalizing this report.

Unless you announce its contents earlier, we plan no further distribution of this report until 30 days from the date of this report. At that time, we will send copies of this report to the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of the Army, the intermediate and senior schools, and appropriate congressional committees. Copies will also be made available to others on request. We are also providing additional reports under separate cover on the results of our work at the Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps intermediate and senior schools on their implementation of similar Panel recommendations.

Accession For	
TIS GRA&I	☒
TIC TAP	☐
unannounced	☐
unannounced	
Distribution/	
Availability Codes	
1st	Avail and/or Special

Please contact me at (202) 275-3990 if you or your staff have any questions. Other major contributors to this report are listed in appendix II.

Sincerely yours,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, reading "Paul L. Jones". The signature is written in dark ink and is positioned above the printed name and title.

Paul L. Jones
Director, Defense Force Management
Issues

Contents

Letter	1
--------	---

Appendix I Status of U.S. Army Command and General Staff College and Army War College Implementation of Panel Recommendations on Professional Military Education	8
---	---

Appendix II Major Contributors to This Report	45
---	----

Glossary	46
----------	----

Tables	
Table I.1: Summary of Intermediate School's Implementation of Various Recommendations	9
Table I.2: Summary of Senior School's Implementation of Various Recommendations	10

Abbreviations

AFSC	Armed Forces Staff College
DOD	Department of Defense
JCS	Joint Chiefs of Staff
JSO	Joint Specialty (Specialist) Officer
MEPD	Military Education Policy Document
PME	professional military education

Status of U.S. Army Command and General Staff College and Army War College Implementation of Panel Recommendations on Professional Military Education

This appendix contains 36 Panel recommendations and summarizes the schools' actions taken in response to those recommendations. Several of the 36 Panel recommendations are applicable only to either the intermediate or senior school and the applicability is noted in tables I.1 and I.2, which provide a summary of the status of these recommendations.

For purposes of this report, we have numbered each Panel recommendation sequentially, from 1 to 36. We identify the subject area of each recommendation and present the actual wording of each, and the same sequencing, as it appears in the Panel report. After each recommendation, we cross-reference to the location of the recommendation in the Panel report. (For example, Key 2 is the second recommendation in the executive summary that contains the key recommendations. Chapter 4, recommendation 6 is the sixth recommendation in chapter 4.) We also provide the page number where the recommendation can be found in the Panel report.

In most cases, the recommendation appears here exactly as it appears in the Panel report, and school officials have addressed the entire recommendation. In certain recommendations that contain multiple parts, however, we have underlined certain portions to identify the applicable parts that school officials addressed.

Each of the 36 recommendations has next been characterized by the schools as implemented, partially implemented, or not implemented. This characterization represents the views of the schools. Non-applicable recommendations have been discussed earlier.

An elaboration of the characterization is provided in the section marked "status." This also represents the views of the schools. In addition, cross-references to related recommendations are provided here when responses are similar.

Appendix I
Status of U.S. Army Command and General
Staff College and Army War College
Implementation of Panel Recommendations
on Professional Military Education

Table I.1: Summary of Intermediate School's Implementation of Various Recommendations

	Panel No.	report^a	Subject	Status of recommendations^b	Page
1	Key 2		Faculty quality	PI	11
2	Key 3		Two-phase education	I	12
3	Key 5		Strategy focus/military faculty and student mix	NA	13
4	Key 9		Frequency of examinations/papers	I	14
5	II-4		Senior school focus on national military strategy	NA	16
6	II-5		Faculty teaching strategy	I	16
7	III-2		Service/joint expertise	I	17
8	III-3		Teaching service/joint systems	I	18
9	III-6		Military faculty mix	PI	19
10	III-8		Student mix	PI	20
11	IV-1		Focus of strategy by school	I	21
12	IV-2		Jointness initiated at intermediate level	I	22
13	IV-3		Phase I availability to all	I	23
14	IV-5		In-residence prerequisite	PI	24
15	IV-6		Service-oriented professional military education (PME)	I	24
16	IV-11		Percent of military faculty mix	PI	25
17	IV-14		Percent of student mix	PI	26
18	IV-24		Focus on national military strategy	NA	26
19	V-1		Recruiting and maintaining quality faculty	I	27
20	V-2		Specialists/career educators	PI	28
21	V-3		Former commanders as faculty	I	29
22	V-4		Faculty development program	I	29
23	V-5		Cadre of career educators	PI	31
24	V-6		In-residence graduates as faculty	PI	32
25	V-8		Retired officers teach without penalty	NA	33
26	V-9		Civilian faculty quality/mix	I	33
27	V-10		Advanced degrees required for senior school faculty	NA	34
28	V-11		Hiring quality civilian faculty	I	35
29	V-12		Student/faculty ratios	PI	35
30	V-13		Faculty exchange with academy	NI	36
31	V-16		Commandant/president as general/flag officers and involvement in instruction	I	37
32	V-23		Active/passive instruction	I	38
33	V-24		Rigorous performance standard	I	39
34	V-25		Evaluation of examinations/papers	I	41
35	V-26		Distinguished graduate program	I	41
36	V-27		Officer efficiency reports	NI	43

Appendix I
Status of U.S. Army Command and General
Staff College and Army War College
Implementation of Panel Recommendations
on Professional Military Education

^aKey recommendations are those recommendations that the Panel identified as key in the executive summary to its report. Recommendations II-4 and II-5 appear in Panel report chapter II, entitled "Educating Strategists." Recommendations III-2 through III-8 appear in Panel report chapter III, entitled "An Expanded Role for Joint Education." Recommendations IV-1 through IV-24 appear in Panel report chapter IV, entitled "Realigning Professional Military Education." Recommendations V-1 through V-27 appear in Panel report chapter V, entitled "Quality."

^bStatus of recommendations:

I = Implemented

PI = Partially implemented

NI = Not implemented

NA = Not applicable

**Table I.2: Summary of Senior School's
Implementation of Various
Recommendations**

Panel No. report ^a	Subject	Status of recommendations ^b	Page
1 Key 2	Faculty quality	PI	11
2 Key 3	Two-phase education	I	12
3 Key 5	Strategy focus/military faculty and student mix	PI	13
4 Key 9	Frequency of examinations/papers	PI	14
5 II-4	Senior school focus on national military strategy	I	16
6 II-5	Faculty teaching strategy	I	16
7 III-2	Service/joint expertise	I	17
8 III-3	Teaching service/joint systems	NA	18
9 III-6	Military faculty mix	PI	19
10 III-8	Student mix	PI	20
11 IV-1	Focus of strategy by school	I	21
12 IV-2	Jointness initiated at intermediate level	NA	22
13 IV-3	Phase I availability to all	I	23
14 IV-5	In-residence prerequisite	NA	24
15 IV-6	Service-oriented professional military education (PME)	I	24
16 IV-11	Percent of military faculty mix	PI	25
17 IV-14	Percent of student mix	PI	26
18 IV-24	Focus on national military strategy	I	26
19 V-1	Recruiting & maintaining quality faculty	I	27
20 V-2	Specialists/career educators	I	28
21 V-3	Former commanders as faculty	I	29
22 V-4	Faculty development program	I	29
23 V-5	Cadre of career educators	I	31
24 V-6	In-residence graduates as faculty	NA	32
25 V-8	Retired officers teach without penalty	I	33
26 V-9	Civilian faculty quality/mix	PI	33
27 V-10	Advanced degrees required for senior school faculty	I	34
28 V-11	Hiring quality civilian faculty	I	35

(continued)

Appendix I
Status of U.S. Army Command and General
Staff College and Army War College
Implementation of Panel Recommendations
on Professional Military Education

	Panel		Status of	
	No. report^a	Subject	recommendations^b	Page
29	V-12	Student/faculty ratios	I	35
30	V-13	Faculty exchange with academy	NI	36
31	V-16	Commandant/president as general/flag officers and involvement in instruction	I	37
32	V-23	Active/passive instruction	I	38
33	V-24	Rigorous performance standard	I	39
34	V-25	Evaluation of examinations/papers	PI	41
35	V-26	Distinguished graduate program	NI	41
36	V-27	Officer efficiency reports	NI	43

^aKey recommendations are those recommendations that the Panel identified as key in the executive summary to its report. Recommendations II-4 and II-5 appear in Panel report chapter II, entitled "Educating Strategists." Recommendations III-2 through III-8 appear in Panel report chapter III, entitled "An Expanded Role for Joint Education." Recommendations IV-1 through IV-24 appear in Panel report chapter IV, entitled "Realigning Professional Military Education." Recommendations V-1 through V-27 appear in Panel report chapter V, entitled "Quality."

^bStatus of recommendations:

I = Implemented

PI = Partially implemented

NI = Not implemented

NA = Not applicable

Recommendation Number 1

Faculty Quality

Improve the quality of faculty (1) by amending present law to facilitate hiring civilian faculty and (2) through actions by the Chairman, JCS, and the service chiefs to ensure that only high-quality military officers are assigned to faculties. (Key 2, Panel Report p. 3.)

Intermediate School Characterization

Partially Implemented.

Status

Legislation has been enacted to facilitate the hiring of civilian faculty. However, the Director of Academic Operations stated that the school has no plans at this time to use the increased authority even if it is delegated to the school. School officials gave several reasons. First, the teaching mission of the school is directed primarily toward tactical and operational warfighting. Military faculty members are better suited to teach these areas than civilian faculty members. In addition, an alternative personnel system would be needed to replace the current system if the new authority is adopted, and bargaining rights and personnel

issues, such as job security and pay, would need to be addressed. Finally, conversion expenses of a new hiring authority system would increase the costs to the school.

Concerning the quality of military faculty, the school has established a group of top level school officials that review and approve all faculty selections. Each department at the school screens prospective faculty candidates against a criteria of required and desired qualifications. These criteria include:

- operational and staff experience and command time,
- intermediate school experience,
- senior service college,
- military specialty skills,
- previous faculty experience, and
- civilian education.

The emphasis placed on the different criteria depends on the teaching focus of an individual department.

Senior School
Characterization

Partially Implemented.

Status

The school intends to use the new hiring authority delegated from Army headquarters before the end of calendar year 1991. In evaluating the quality of military officers, the school's present criteria emphasizes operational, functional/foreign area specialty, and teaching experience. The school uses this information to assess the total record of potential faculty members before selections are made.

Recommendation Number 2

Two-Phase Education

Establish a two-phase Joint Specialist Officer (JSO) education process with Phase I taught in service colleges and a follow-on, temporary duty Phase II taught at the Armed Forces Staff College (AFSC). (Key 3, Panel Report p. 3.)

Appendix I
Status of U.S. Army Command and General
Staff College and Army War College
Implementation of Panel Recommendations
on Professional Military Education

Intermediate School
Characterization

Implemented.

Status

The Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff (JCS), has established a two-phase process and the school teaches Phase I. In academic year 1989-90, the school integrated Phase I program requirements into its curriculum.

Senior School
Characterization

Implemented.

Status

This school has implemented this process in a similar manner as the intermediate school.

Recommendation
Number 3

Strategy Focus/Military
Faculty and Student Mix

At the senior service colleges (1) make national military strategy the primary focus and (2) increase the mix by service of both the military faculty and military students. (Key 5, Panel Report p. 5.)

Senior School
Characterization

Partially Implemented.

Status

Of the various components of the curriculum for academic year 1990-91, national military strategy comprises the largest portion (22 percent), thereby making it the primary focus. In addition, students are also exposed to other strategic aspects that may be needed throughout their career.

The school is required to implement Military Education Policy Document (MEPD) guidance for PME, which requires fewer faculty and students from the other services than that required by the Panel. (See recommendation 16.) For example, the school gets 8 percent of its teaching faculty from the Air Force and 7 percent from the Navy. The Panel recommends that both give 25 percent each. The school plans to eventually implement the MEPD guidance of a combined 25 percent.

Concerning student mix, the Panel recommends that this school should eventually have a 25-percent representation from both the Air Force

and the Navy. (See recommendation 17.) The school has a mix of 6 percent each from the Air Force and the Navy/Marine Corps and they plan to eventually meet the MEPD goal, which is half that of the Panel.

Recommendation Number 4

Frequency of Examinations/Papers

Require students at both intermediate and senior PME schools to complete frequent essay-type examinations and to write papers and reports that are thoroughly reviewed, critiqued, and graded by faculty. (Key 9, Panel Report p. 7.)

Intermediate School Characterization

Implemented.

Status

The school requires students to demonstrate standards of performance through a variety of graded evaluation instruments, including:

- tests,
- essay papers,
- graded briefings,
- critiques,
- spot quizzes, and
- developing battle plans and orders.

Students are graded for class participation in nearly all courses. Each basic core subcourse and elective has a written evaluation plan that describes standards and grading policies. During the academic year, students are required to complete seven required electives, which include certain special electives that correspond to their branch grouping—combat, combat support, combat service support fields, and special forces. Nearly all of the seven electives require papers, presentations, or examinations.

Instructors use the following grades for all courses taught at the school:

- A - Exceeded standards.
- B - Fully met standards.
- C - Marginally met standards.

Appendix I
Status of U.S. Army Command and General
Staff College and Army War College
Implementation of Panel Recommendations
on Professional Military Education

- U - Failed to meet standards.
- I - Incomplete.

In addition, when students complete each course, the instructors prepare formal written evaluations to provide in-depth feedback on performance against written standards.

Senior School
Characterization

Partially Implemented.

Status

School policy requires students to prepare frequent papers, give oral reports, and prepare and participate in case studies, exercises, reviews, analyses, and other forms of active learning. Student performance is evaluated through a combination of frequent oral and written requirements as individuals and in groups.

The number of written requirements depends on the mix of core and advanced courses the student takes. School officials estimated that the typical student averages 10 graded requirements: 4 or 5 from the core courses and 5 or 6 from the advanced courses. Students must also complete a major graded research paper before graduation. The paper takes most students about 430 hours to research and write. Students also submit a number of smaller point papers and written assignments.

The school does not award letter grades at this time, and has no plans to do so in the future. Instead, it has a one-on-one system of detailed oral and written comments as well as hierarchical grading for each evaluated requirement. The school evaluates student performance against specific standards and uses these evaluations to help improve the student's knowledge of the subject. Instructors use the following criteria for all evaluated requirements:

- Exceeds standards.
- Meets standards.
- Needs improvement.
- Fails to meet standards.

School officials said that students are from the top 6 percent of Army officers who are eligible to attend a senior school. Therefore, officials said their competition should be based on mastering the curriculum objectives.

Recommendation Number 5

Senior School Focus on National Military Strategy

The revamped National War College (or the proposed National Center for Strategic Studies) should focus on national security strategy. The service war colleges should make national military strategy their primary focus and gradually but significantly increase the portion of their curriculum devoted to the subject. (Chapter II, No. 4, Panel Report p. 41.)

Senior School Characterization

Implemented.

Status

In academic year 1987-88, national military strategy encompassed about 17 percent of the school curriculum and was not its primary focus. In academic year 1990-91, it has become the primary focus with about 22 percent of the curriculum devoted to the subject. Over half of the core curriculum addresses strategic level subjects that revolve around national military strategy.

Recommendation Number 6

Faculty Teaching Strategy

The strategy faculty should consist of civilian educators, active duty and retired military specialists, and former senior military officers. To ensure that students have access to the depth of knowledge that only a career of scholarship in a particular area can produce, respected civilian educators who are recognized experts in specific disciplines related to the teaching of strategy should be faculty members at senior schools. Active duty and retired military officers with actual experience in the strategic arena are also needed for strategy instruction. Finally, a few carefully selected retired three- and four-star officers can contribute significantly to the teaching of operational art, campaign analyses, national military strategy, and national security strategy. (Chapter II, No. 5, Panel Report p. 41.)

Appendix I
Status of U.S. Army Command and General
Staff College and Army War College
Implementation of Panel Recommendations
on Professional Military Education

Intermediate School
Characterization

Implemented.

Status

The faculty strategy is comprised of 48 members—2 civilian instructors, 45 active military officers, and 1 retired military officer. The civilian educators possess advanced degrees in related fields, are respected in their fields, and are required by job descriptions to have a publication in their field each year. Active duty or retired officers with actual experience in the strategic arena make up 25 of the 48 faculty members teaching strategy. Although the school has no retired general officers among its teaching faculty, it invites active duty and retired general officers for special presentations about once a month. School officials said that virtually all of these presentations pertain to military strategy and the substance is interwoven with the remaining strategy curriculum. School instruction focuses at the operational level, and introduces students to national military strategy.

Senior School
Characterization

Implemented.

Status

The faculty combines experienced military, retired military, and civilian educators. Faculty members are hired for a specific expertise, but are also expected to develop the additional mastery of broad issues needed to teach at a graduate level institution. Faculty members have the collective expertise to teach strategy, joint military subjects, leadership, and operational topics. Army officials said that the civilian faculty enhances and balances curriculum areas.

Different aspects of strategy are taught at the school. Although national military strategy is the central focus, it is not limited to a single course or faculty group. Therefore, all of the 72 teaching faculty members cover strategy in some form.

Recommendation
Number 7

Service/Joint Expertise

For joint education to be meaningful and productive, a prerequisite for officers is competence commensurate with their rank in all elements of their own service in professional knowledge and understanding (e.g., in

the Navy, surface, aviation and subsurface) as well as demonstrated performance. Also an integral part of joint education is an officer's study of the other services. (Chapter III, No. 2, Panel Report p. 81.)

Intermediate School
Characterization

Implemented.

Status

The school curriculum includes a study of Army elements as well as the study of operations of the Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps in a joint environment. Students attending this school are selected from among the top 50 percent of eligible Army officers.

Senior School
Characterization

Implemented.

Status

Officers attending this school already have service expertise and have demonstrated operational competence. At this school, students concentrate on joint operations to include the study of Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps doctrines and operations. Students attending this school are selected from among the top 6 percent of eligible Army officers.

Recommendation Number 8

Teaching Service/Joint
Systems

The Service intermediate schools should teach both joint and service systems—organizations, processes, procedures, and staff skills—to all students. This is necessary to meet the Goldwater-Nichols Act requirement to revise the curricula of service schools to strengthen the focus on joint matters and prepare officers for joint duty assignments. (Chapter III, No. 3, Panel Report p. 81.)

Intermediate School
Characterization

Implemented.

Status

During academic year 1987-88, the school had a separate elective program for officers nominated for the joint specialty. This was in addition to a general knowledge based curriculum of joint subject matter taught within the core curriculum. Since academic year 1988-89, a joint curriculum designed to strengthen the focus on joint matters has been fully

incorporated within the core curriculum to cover aspects of each service. For example, it encompasses the Panel as well as MEPD guidance on joint matters, including joint operational warfare, joint systems, and joint operation planning.

Recommendation Number 9

Military Faculty Mix

The mix of military faculty from each military department is a key factor in joint education. In schools that educate joint specialists, the standard should be equal representation from each of the three military departments. For other schools, representation from each department should eventually be substantially higher than today. These standards should apply to the entire active duty military faculty, not some fraction designated as a nominal "joint education" department. (Chapter III, No. 6, Panel Report p. 82.)

Intermediate School Characterization

Partially Implemented.

Status

The school uses the MEPD definition to determine faculty mix. Individuals who conduct research, teach, or prepare or design curricula are considered faculty.

The Panel recommends a 10-percent representation each from the Air Force and Navy/Marine Corps for academic year 1990-91. (See recommendation 16.) However, the school's faculty is composed of about 4 percent each from the Air Force and the Navy/Marine Corps for this year. The Panel recommends 15 percent for later academic years. School officials plan to eventually implement MEPD guidance (5 percent from each service department) for military faculty mix but have no plans at this time to implement the Panel's recommendation.

Senior School Characterization

Partially Implemented.

Status

For academic year 1990-91, the school has 8 percent of its faculty from the Air Force and 7 percent from the Navy/Marine Corps. The school's goal for faculty mix is 50 percent from the Army, 25 percent from the

Air Force and Navy/Marine Corps, and 25 percent from the civilian community. This is the MEPD guidance. The Panel recommends 25 percent each from the Air Force and Navy/Marine Corps.

Recommendation Number 10

Student Mix

The mix of students from each military department is another key factor in joint education. In schools that educate joint specialists, the standard should be equal representation from each of the three military departments. For other schools, representation from each department in the entire student body should eventually be substantially higher than today. In addition, the student body mix should consist of students of equally high caliber from each military department. Finally, each service should provide a representative mix of students from all combat arms branches and warfare specialties. (Chapter III, No. 8, Panel Report p. 82.)

Intermediate School Characterization

Partially Implemented.

Status

Currently, the school has 1 student from the Air Force or Navy/Marine Corps for each of its 80 seminar or class groups for academic year 1990-91. It plans to implement MEPD guidance that requires one student each from the Air Force and Navy/Marine Corps. For academic year 1992-93, the school intends to increase its mix to a total of two students per seminar from the Air Force and Navy/Marine Corps in any combination. However, the Panel recommends two students from each or a total of four. (See recommendation 17.)

Officials told us that students from the Air Force, Navy, and Marine Corps are of equal caliber to that of the Army students and that the Air Force and Navy/Marine Corps have provided a representative mix of combat arms branches and warfare specialties for academic year 1990-91.

Senior School Characterization

Partially Implemented.

Appendix I
 Status of U.S. Army Command and General
 Staff College and Army War College
 Implementation of Panel Recommendations
 on Professional Military Education

Status	The school has already implemented the MEPD guidance of 1 student from the Air Force or Navy/Marine Corps for each of the 16 seminar groups. It is willing to double the number of other service students if the loss in Army students is offset by a gain in Army students at the other senior schools. This would still be less than the Panel's goal of 25 percent from each of the other services. School officials stated that they have received equally high caliber students from the other services for academic year 1990-91. The Air Force and Navy/Marine Corps have sent a representative mix of combat arms and warfare specialists in academic year 1990-91.
--------	---

Recommendation Number 11

Focus of Strategy by School	The Secretary of Defense, with the advice and assistance of the Chairman, JCS, should establish a clear, coherent conceptual framework for the PME system. The primary subject matter for PME schools and, consequently, the underlying theme of the PME framework, should be the employment of combat forces, the conduct of war. Each element of the PME framework should be related to the employment of combat forces. <u>The primary focus for each school level should be stated in terms of the three major levels of warfare, that is, tactical, theater (operational), and strategic. Each school level should be responsible for a specific level of warfare as follows:</u> <table border="0"> <tr> <td>Flag/General Officer</td><td>National Security Strategy</td></tr> <tr> <td>Senior</td><td>National Military Strategy</td></tr> <tr> <td>Intermediate</td><td>Combined Arms Operations and Joint Operational Art</td></tr> <tr> <td>Primary</td><td>Branch of Warfare Specialty</td></tr> </table> • At the primary level an officer should learn about, in Army terms, his own branch (infantry, armor, artillery, etc.) or in Navy terms, his warfare specialty (surface, aviation, and submarines). • <u>At the intermediate level, where substantial formal joint professional military education begins, an officer should broaden his knowledge to include both (1) other branches of his own service and how they operate together (what the Army calls "combined arms" operations) and (2) other military services and how they operate together in theater-level</u>	Flag/General Officer	National Security Strategy	Senior	National Military Strategy	Intermediate	Combined Arms Operations and Joint Operational Art	Primary	Branch of Warfare Specialty
Flag/General Officer	National Security Strategy								
Senior	National Military Strategy								
Intermediate	Combined Arms Operations and Joint Operational Art								
Primary	Branch of Warfare Specialty								

warfare (commonly referred to as "operational art"). The service intermediate colleges should focus on joint operations from a service perspective (service headquarters or service component of a unified command); AFSC should focus from a joint perspective (JCS, unified command, or joint task force).

- At the senior level, an officer should broaden his knowledge still further to learn about national strategy and the interaction of the services in strategic operations. The senior service schools should focus on national military strategy. The National War College should focus on national security strategy, not only the military element of national power but also the economic, diplomatic, and political elements. Graduates of service war colleges should attend the senior joint school. (Chapter IV, No. 1, Panel Report p. 125.)

Intermediate School
Characterization

Implemented.

Status

The Secretary of Defense and the Chairman, JCS, established an educational framework for the PME system. In implementing this framework, the school focuses about 67 percent of its curriculum on large unit warfighting within the context of operational art. Within this focus, about 31 percent of the curriculum is devoted to joint and combined education.

Senior School
Characterization

Implemented.

Status

The primary focus is national military strategy and includes 22 percent of the curriculum.

Recommendation Number 12

Jointness Initiated at Intermediate Level

Although students should be introduced to joint matters at pre-commissioning and primary-level schools, it is at the intermediate schools that substantial joint education should begin. (Chapter IV, No. 2, Panel Report p. 126.)

Intermediate School
 Characterization

Implemented.

Status

As stated in recommendation 8, the school abandoned its joint track and now all students receive Phase I joint education. The school devotes about 31 percent (or 189 hours) of its core curriculum to joint and combined education in academic year 1990-91.

Recommendation Number 13

Phase I Availability to All

The Secretary of Defense, with the advice and assistance of the Chairman, JCS, should establish a two-phase Joint Specialty Officer (JSO) education process. The service colleges should teach Phase I joint education to all students. Building on this foundation, AFSC should teach a follow-on temporary-duty Phase II to graduates of service colleges en route to assignments as joint specialists. Because of the Phase I preparation, Phase II should be shorter and more intense than the current AFSC course. The curricula for the two phases should be as follows:

- Phase I curriculum at service colleges should include: capabilities and limitations, doctrine, organizational concepts, and command and control of forces of all services; joint planning processes and systems; and the role of service component commands as part of a unified command.
- Phase II curriculum at AFSC should build on Phase I and concentrate on the integrated deployment and employment of multi-service forces. The course should provide time for: (a) a detailed survey course in joint doctrine; (b) several extensive case studies or war games that focus on the specifics of joint warfare and that involve theaters of war set in both developed and underdeveloped regions; (c) increasing the understanding of the four service cultures; and (d) most important, developing joint attitudes and perspectives. (Chapter IV, No. 3, Panel Report p. 126.)

Intermediate School
 Characterization

Implemented.

Status

The school's curricula now includes the components of phased education.

**Appendix I
Status of U.S. Army Command and General
Staff College and Army War College
Implementation of Panel Recommendations
on Professional Military Education**

Senior School
Characterization

Implemented.

Status

Similar to the intermediate school, this school has adopted the components of phased education.

**Recommendation
Number 14**

In-Residence Prerequisite

In-residence service intermediate education should be a prerequisite for attendance at AFSC to ensure that students are already competent in their own service, that they have acquired basic staff skills, and that they have achieved a minimal level of education in joint matters. (Chapter IV, No. 5, Panel Report p. 127.)

Intermediate School
Characterization

Partially Implemented.

Status

Although the school sends in-resident graduates to AFSC for Phase II education, it plans to forward a request to Army headquarters asking that its non-resident program be certified for Phase I training. After certification from the Chairman, JCS, the school plans to allow non-resident graduates to attend AFSC.

**Recommendation
Number 15**

Service-Oriented PME

Service schools provide valuable service-oriented PME and they should be preserved. Service schools and joint tracks should not be accreted for joint specialist education. (Chapter IV, No. 6, Panel Report p. 127.)

Intermediate School
Characterization

Implemented.

Status

School officials agree that their service-oriented PME should be preserved. The school offered two educational tracks in academic year

1988-89. One was a core track that all students attended while the other, a joint education track, was offered to selected students. This approach was abandoned in academic year 1989-90, and all students now receive service specific and Phase I joint education.

Senior School
Characterization

Implemented.

Status

As discussed above, the school has also preserved its focus and has abandoned its joint track so that all students now receive both a service-oriented and joint education.

Recommendation Number 16

Percent of Military Faculty
Mix

For the service schools, the Chairman, JCS, should develop a phased plan to meet the following standards:

- The senior service schools should have military faculty mixes approximating 10 percent from each of the two non-host military departments by academic year 1989-90 and 25 percent by academic year 1995-96.
- The intermediate service schools should have military faculty mixes approximating 10 percent from each of the two non-host military departments by academic year 1990-91 and 15 percent by academic year 1995-96. (Chapter IV, No. 11, Panel Report p. 127.)

Intermediate School
Characterization

Partially Implemented.

Status

As stated in recommendation 9, school officials plan to implement the MEPD guidance instead of the Panel's goals.

Senior School
Characterization

Partially Implemented.

Status

As stated in recommendation 9, this school also plans to only implement the MEPD guidance at this time.

Recommendation Number 17

Percent of Student Mix

For the service schools, the Chairman, JCS, should develop a phased plan to meet the following standards:

- The senior service schools should have student body mixes approximating 10 percent from each of the two non-host military departments by academic year 1989-90 and 25 percent by academic year 1995-96.
- The intermediate schools should have student body mixes of one officer from each of the two non-host military departments per student seminar by academic year 1990-91 and two officers per seminar by academic year 1995-96. Eventually, each military department should be represented by at least three students in each intermediate school seminar. (Chapter IV, No. 14, Panel Report p. 128.)

Intermediate School Characterization

Partially Implemented.

Status

As stated in recommendation 10, the school plans to implement the MEPD guidance instead of the Panel's recommendation.

Senior School Characterization

Partially Implemented.

Status

As stated in recommendation 10, this school has already implemented MEPD guidance instead of the Panel's recommendation. School officials said they are willing to double students from the Air Force and the Navy if Army student representation is increased at the other senior schools.

Recommendation Number 18

Focus on National Military Strategy

The senior service colleges should make national military strategy their primary focus. (Chapter IV, No. 24, Panel Report p. 130.)

Senior School
Characterization

Implemented.

Status

For details of actions taken, see discussion under recommendations 3, 5, and 11.

Recommendation Number 19

Recruiting and
Maintaining Quality
Faculty

Faculty is the key element in determining the quality of education in PME schools. To develop an outstanding faculty, the impetus must start at the top. The Chairman, JCS, and the service chiefs must place a very high priority on recruiting and maintaining highly qualified faculty to teach at both joint and service PME colleges. (Chapter V, No. 1, Panel Report p. 167.)

Intermediate School
Characterization

Implemented.

Status

The Chairman, JCS, has developed a policy that is being used by the school to recruit and maintain a highly qualified faculty. The school has made recruiting and maintaining a quality faculty a high priority. (Additional details on improving faculty quality are provided in recommendations 1 and 26.)

Senior School
Characterization

Implemented.

Status

The school has also implemented the Chairman, JCS, policy through its objectives and has placed a high priority on recruiting and maintaining a high quality faculty. (Additional details on improving faculty quality are provided in recommendations 1 and 26.)

Recommendation Number 20

Specialists/Career Educators

Military faculty should include three groups: officers with current, credible credentials in operations; specialists in important functional areas; and career educators. Incentives must exist to attract outstanding military officers in each of these groups. (Chapter V, No. 2, Panel Report p. 167.)

Intermediate School Characterization

Partially Implemented.

Status

The school has military faculty from the first two groups. It does not have career tenured military educators. Instead, it defines faculty with multiple teaching assignments as career educators. In addition, the school has initiated action to tenure one of its faculty positions for a 5-year appointment, with the incumbent being eligible for extension annually to 8 years, or to mandatory retirement, whichever comes first.

The following incentives helped to attract outstanding military officers:

- Opportunities to earn a master's degree in adult education. The school cooperates with the Kansas State University in sponsoring a graduate program on post. Six credits from the school are also transferable toward a master's degree in education.
- Excellent facilities for individual and family needs.
- An opportunity to apply their master's degree in education in a school environment.

Senior School Characterization

Implemented.

Status

The school has faculty in all three groups. The school has the following incentives to attract them:

- Opportunities to work on advanced degrees.
- Tenure for eight military faculty staff members.
- Opportunities to switch between teaching and research areas.
- Interaction between high quality students and faculty members.
- Excellent facilities for individual and family needs.

Recommendation Number 21

Former Commanders as Faculty

Service chiefs should ensure that more former commanders who have clear potential for further promotion and for command assignments serve on PME faculties. Their teaching tours should be relatively short and should not preclude them from competing for command and key staff positions; rather, a faculty assignment should enhance their competitiveness. (Chapter V, No. 3, Panel Report p. 167.)

Intermediate School Characterization

Implemented.

Status

Former commanders comprise 7 percent of the school's faculty. An additional 88 percent possess significant staff experience. Taken together, 95 percent of the military faculty has prior command and staff experience. The average teaching tour in the Army is 3 years. School officials stated that, upon completion, officers serving on the faculty are competitive with non-faculty officers in promotion and assignment decisions.

Senior School Characterization

Implemented.

Status

Over 65 percent of the military faculty has prior command experience. School officials believe that faculty members are competitive with officers who did not serve on a faculty. For example, five faculty members were promoted to general/flag rank in fiscal year 1990, compared to only one in fiscal year 1989.

Recommendation Number 22

Faculty Development Program

The services should develop programs to qualify military faculty members to ensure they are prepared professionally. These programs could include prior graduate education, faculty conferences, and sabbaticals at other institutions. Those military faculty who lack education or teaching experience need the opportunity to participate in a faculty development

program to enhance their knowledge and teaching skills prior to assuming responsibilities in the classroom. The panel opposes the widespread practice of retaining graduating officers as faculty for the following year. Graduating students should have additional experience prior to teaching. (Chapter V, No. 4, Panel Report p. 167.)

**Intermediate School
Characterization**

Implemented.

Status

Army headquarters and major commands have established policy to cover military faculty qualification programs that the school uses. All faculty members participate in the school's faculty development program. The program consists of initial instructor training followed by continued development at the academic departmental level. Intra-faculty development is also available through the Combined Arms Center, the school, and participation in the Kansas Center Regional Council on Higher Education faculty enrichment programs.

The school retained 34, or 3 percent, of its graduating students from academic year 1989-90 as instructors. The school screens students for the required operational experience and academic credentials. Of the 34 students retained as instructors, only 3 lacked staff experience at the battalion or brigade level, but they had specialized skills needed by the school.

**Senior School
Characterization**

Implemented.

Status

The school sponsors different initiatives that encourage faculty development and excellence, including:

- Eight military faculty members are now tenured.
- Former faculty members are recognized as "Distinguished Fellows." (Six awards have been made to date.)
- Academic chairs are established to recognize faculty members for significant contributions. All 11 chair positions have been named.
- Representatives are provided to 40 different conferences, meetings, and symposia, worldwide. Representatives attend, lecture, and develop a broader perspective on worldwide issues and problems.

The school also holds a week-long faculty development program to prepare and orient faculty members. The topics covered in the program include an overview of curriculum, standards, evaluation/feedback, and

role of faculty, among others. Opportunities for self-development are also discussed and various other opportunities, such as the Advanced Management Program, are made available throughout the year.

The school retained six, or about 2 percent, of the graduating students from academic year 1989-90 as faculty members. Students are retained on a case-by-case basis for immediate follow-on assignment. An advantage of retaining selected students is the use of special skills. In some years, the school has not retained any graduating students.

Recommendation Number 23

Cadre of Career Educators

The services should develop a cadre of career educators for PME institutions similar to those at West Point. They should have an academic foundation, preferably a doctorate, in the area they are to teach as well as an exemplary military record based on solid performance. Military educators and functional area specialists should be given the opportunity to strengthen their academic credential, and the careers of the former should be managed like those of other "professional" groups in the military. (Chapter V, No. 5, Panel Report p. 167.)

Intermediate School Characterization

Partially Implemented.

Status

The school does not have career military educators, but 48 members of its military staff are experienced instructors on their second or third assignment as educators. Some of these members also have an additional code in their permanent records that identifies them as having multiple teaching tours. School officials believe that military faculty members with current operational experience are better suited than career military educators to teach the warfighting curriculum based on modern organizational concepts, doctrine, and military subjects because of the continuous modernization process associated with warfighting. They state that officers with strong operational experience, coupled with civilian education, are better prepared to teach.

In December 1990, school officials told us that they plan to seek authority from Army headquarters to establish a tenured career educator position for one of their department chairs. This, if approved, would be the school's first career educator.

Senior School
Characterization

Implemented.

Status

The school does have a cadre of career military educators. The military faculty includes 42 experienced instructors with 1 or more past teaching assignments. Military faculty members of proven quality are eligible for eight limited tenure positions—all have been filled. Tenure positions are reserved for outstanding teachers. Military faculty selected for tenure are permitted to remain at the school until retirement.

School officials stated that the military faculty members have a strong academic foundation. Military educators continue to strengthen their credentials through publishing, attending conferences, and other continuing education fora.

Recommendation Number 24

In-Residence Graduates as
Faculty

As a goal, about 75 percent of the military faculty at the intermediate schools should be graduates of an in-residence intermediate (or higher) school and should have an advanced degree. (Chapter V, No. 6, Panel Report p. 167.)

Intermediate School
Characterization

Partially Implemented.

Status

The MEPD guidance states that 75 percent of the faculty should be graduates of an intermediate school; it does not distinguish between in-residence and non-resident. By applying this criteria, the school has 94 percent of its faculty having graduated from an in-residence or non-resident intermediate school with an advanced degree. However, based on the Panel's guidelines, 68 percent of the school's faculty graduated from an in-residence intermediate school and has an advanced degree.

Recommendation Number 25

Retired Officers Teach Without Penalty

Selected retired officers, particularly senior general and flag officers, could contribute appreciably to the teaching of operational art and military strategy at the war colleges. The dual compensation law should be amended to waive the financial penalties these officers incur by serving their country again. (Chapter V, No. 8, Panel Report pp. 167-68.)

Senior School Characterization

Implemented.

Status

Although the dual compensation law was not amended, the school uses retired colonels and generals as guest lecturers and speakers in professional development courses, core subjects, and advanced curriculum topics. During academic year 1989-90, six retired generals spoke on operational art and military strategy. In addition, four retired colonels lectured on special subjects and were faculty members. An additional 11 non-faculty retired colonels spoke on various topics relating to operational art and military strategy. These retired officers were not affected by the financial penalties under the level compensation law since they were not hired on a full-time basis as faculty members.

Recommendation Number 26

Civilian Faculty Quality/ Mix

The PME faculty should have a high-quality civilian component in order for PME schools to attain a genuine "graduate" level of education. The civilian faculty should be a mixture of experienced, well-respected individuals of national stature, who, in combination with outstanding younger Ph.D.s, will provide balance, expertise, and continuity. Civilian professors must continue to research and publish not only to keep themselves in the forefront of their academic field, but also to ensure their academic credibility. The panel believes that civilian faculty are particularly important at senior colleges, where they should make up a substantial portion, perhaps around one-third, of the faculty. (Chapter V, No. 9, Panel Report p. 168.)

Appendix I
Status of U.S. Army Command and General
Staff College and Army War College
Implementation of Panel Recommendations
on Professional Military Education

Intermediate School
Characterization

Implemented.

Status

Out of 37 civilian faculty members at the school, 32 have advanced degrees. School officials said these instructors are well respected in their field of expertise, and are encouraged to publish in their field each year.

Senior School
Characterization

Partially Implemented.

Status

All 13 members of the civilian faculty have advanced degrees, of which 10 possess doctoral degrees. The civilian faculty makes up about 17 percent of the total faculty. The school plans to increase the civilian faculty to 25 percent of the teaching faculty. However, no plans have been made to implement the Panel recommendation of civilians comprising approximately one-third of the faculty. Faculty members' biographies show numerous examples of published books, articles, and papers. Faculty development is also encouraged through a variety of internal and external programs, including a faculty development program, seminars, and lectures.

Recommendation
Number 27

Advanced Degrees
Required for Senior School
Faculty

As a goal, all members of the faculty at senior schools should have advanced degrees. The panel believes that a doctorate is desirable. (Chapter V, No. 10, Panel Report p. 168.)

Senior School
Characterization

Implemented.

Status

In academic year 1989-90, about 94 percent of the teaching faculty had advanced degrees and about 20 percent held doctoral degrees. School officials said they are attempting to have 100 percent of the faculty with advanced degrees.

Recommendation Number 28

Hiring Quality Civilian Faculty

Stronger incentives are also needed to attract a high-quality civilian faculty. The law should be amended to give the Secretary of Defense and each service secretary the same flexibility in employing and compensating civilian faculty that the Secretary of the Navy currently has under 10 USC 7478. (Chapter V, No. 11, Panel Report p. 168.)

Intermediate School Characterization

Implemented.

Status

Legislation that gives the Secretary of the Army civilian hiring authority has already been enacted. (See also recommendations 1 and 26 for additional details.)

Senior School Characterization

Implemented.

Status

Legislation has already been enacted. Civilian hiring and compensation under title 10 was implemented in January 1991. (This recommendation is also discussed under recommendations 1 and 26.)

Recommendation Number 29

Student/Faculty Ratios

The student/faculty ratios at the professional military institutions should be sufficiently low to allow time for faculty development programs, research, and writing. The panel envisions a range between 3 and 4 to 1, with the lower ratios at the senior schools. The panel also recommends that additional faculty, principally civilian, be provided to the National Defense University schools and that the Secretary of Defense, with the advice of the Chairman, JCS, assure the comparability of the joint and service school student/faculty ratios. (Chapter V, No. 12, Panel Report p. 168.)

Appendix I
Status of U.S. Army Command and General
Staff College and Army War College
Implementation of Panel Recommendations
on Professional Military Education

Intermediate School
Characterization

Partially Implemented.

Status

The school's student/faculty ratio has been lowered to 4.1 to 1 for academic year 1990-91. School officials stated that projected staffing cuts will make it difficult to maintain low student/faculty ratios. Even though the school's work force will be reduced, school officials intend to retain a small group/active learning mode of instruction.

Senior School
Characterization

Implemented.

This school's ratio remains at 3.7 to 1 for academic year 1990-91. However, school officials stated that when other instructors, such as adjunct teaching faculty are included, the ratio is 2.6 to 1. In both cases, opportunities are provided for faculty development programs, research, and writing.

Recommendation
Number 30

Faculty Exchange With
Academy

The services should study the feasibility of improving their faculties by using members of service academy faculties on an exchange basis to teach at PME institutions. (Chapter V, No. 13, Panel Report p. 168.)

Intermediate School
Characterization

Not Implemented.

Status

An Army feasibility study is not considered beneficial to the school and was not performed because school officials said the missions and purposes of the school and the academies are different. The school's disciplines are drawn heavily from operational and doctrinal sources, while the academies draw from undergraduate academic sources. In the overlapping disciplines, primarily history, communicative skills, and strategy, the school presently benefits from having several officers who are former academy instructors and actively seeks assignment of similar officers. School officials stated that instructor exchanges between the two institutions would involve additional costs.

Appendix I
Status of U.S. Army Command and General
Staff College and Army War College
Implementation of Panel Recommendations
on Professional Military Education

Senior School
Characterization

Not Implemented.

Status

The school considered the possibility of using an academy history professor for a 1-year appointment. This exchange is not going to occur because of fundamental differences between the two programs. This school is a graduate-level institution for senior Army officers focusing on military strategy. In comparison, the academy teaches pre-commissioned students at the undergraduate level. The school does accept one academy faculty member as a Fellow in each resident class. This individual teaches in his/her area of expertise when appropriate. School officials consider this beneficial to the school.

Recommendation
Number 31

Commandant/President as
General/Flag Officers and
Involvement in Instruction

Ideally, the commandants or presidents should be general/flag officers with promotion potential, some expertise in education, and operational knowledge. They should become actively involved in teaching the student body. (Chapter V, No. 16, Panel Report p. 168.)

Intermediate School
Characterization

Implemented.

Status

The deputy commandant, a brigadier general, serves as the senior instructor, mentor, and role model for students attending the intermediate school. The deputy commandant is selected by the Secretary of the Army and the Army Chief of Staff based on (1) the ability to contribute to leader development and (2) experience and expertise as an educator, a senior tactician, and a strategist. The past four deputy commandants were generals and have since been promoted to higher rank and positions.

Senior School
Characterization

Implemented.

Status

Each of the past five commandants has been a general/flag (major general) officer and has been promoted to either lieutenant general or general. Both the Secretary of the Army and the Army Chief of Staff select

commandants based on experience and expertise as an educator, strategist, and ability to contribute to senior leader development.

Not only does the commandant participate in curriculum development, but is also actively involved in teaching and monitoring the student body. Throughout the 1990-91 academic year, the commandant works with students to (1) provide updates on key world events, (2) interact during seminars and other academic activities, and (3) provide personal guidance and insights on special projects.

Recommendation Number 32

Active/Passive Instruction

The Chairman, JCS, and service chiefs should review the current methods of instruction at PME schools to reduce significantly the curriculum that is being taught by passive methods (e.g., lectures, films). PME education should involve study, research, writing, reading, and seminar activity—and, in order to promote academic achievement, students should be graded. The commendably low 10-percent passive education for the Army Command and General Staff College sets a goal for the other schools. (Chapter V, No. 23, Panel Report p. 169.)

Intermediate School Characterization

Implemented.

The school defines active learning as time spent by students primarily in the classroom environment. For academic year 1990-91, about 80 percent of the core curriculum will be taught using the active learning method.

Data gathered when the Panel reviewed the school in 1987-88 indicates that active teaching methods were 78 percent and not 90 percent as stated in its April 1989 report. The school defines passive learning as time spent in lectures outside the seminar setting. For academic year 1990-91, approximately 20 percent of the curriculum will be taught using the passive learning method.

Elective classes are typically small in number and considered 90 to 95 percent active learning. Additional time spent reading, writing, or preparing for class is not included in the active hours calculation. The

Appendix I
Status of U.S. Army Command and General
Staff College and Army War College
Implementation of Panel Recommendations
on Professional Military Education

school intends to keep its active learning at 80 percent or higher. When elective instruction is included as part of the core curriculum, the typical Army intermediate student averages over 85 percent active instruction.

Implemented.

Excluding guest lectures, the school's teaching methodologies emphasize active learning. Almost 4 of every 5 available hours over a 200-academic day year, or 80 percent, are dedicated to active learning. School officials believe this is the optimal level of active learning. Core and advanced course active instruction involves seminar group discussions, oral briefings, written papers, and case studies. All these activities are graded by faculty members.

Directed study is time reserved in the curriculum plan that lets students complete readings, prepare oral briefings, and prepare for classes. Complementary programs include automation for executives, health and fitness, athletics, television communication workshops, military family programs, elective writings, and noontime lectures. Graded requirements are incorporated throughout to measure how well students have mastered key subjects.

Recommendation
Number 33

Rigorous Performance
Standard

The Chairman, JCS, and each service chief should establish rigorous standards of academic performance. The panel defines academic rigor to include a challenging curriculum, student accountability for mastering this curriculum, and established standards against which student performance is measured. (Chapter V, No. 24, Panel Report p. 169.)

Intermediate School
Characterization

Implemented.

Status

A process has been developed to help ensure a rigorous system. The process requires each course to have specific learning objectives with measurable standards. School officials said that faculty and high standards

are the key to rigor at the school. The school conducts year-round faculty training programs to ensure standards are maintained throughout the curriculum. In addition, letter grades are given and students are also required to write papers, give presentations, take examinations, and participate in classroom discussions and exercises.

This school is accredited to award a master's degree. In 1985, the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools granted this school a 10-year accreditation, the highest possible ranking.

Senior School
Characterization

Implemented.

Status

The school's curriculum emphasizes active learning. Rigor is the measure of achieving excellence. Students complete frequent oral and written requirements that are evaluated against specific criteria. Students must meet standards or redo papers and briefings. The curriculum measures students against a standard rather than against one another. Students work individually on projects and as a part of groups. School officials said that a strategic environment, where complex situations have no simple solution, demands problem solving through negotiation and consensus building.

The American Council on Education, in January 1990, awarded the school resident course credit for 22 to 25 graduate-level hours, plus 12 upper-level undergraduate hours. This equates to a typical course load in a 1-year master's level program. An equivalent master's level thesis activity of about 430 hours for the average student is also required.

Although the school offers a rigorous program, it does not award letter grades. The Panel, in several hearings, has asked the schools to award letter grades. The school has no plans at this time for awarding letter grades.

Recommendation Number 34

Evaluation of Examinations/Papers

All intermediate- and senior-level PME schools should require students to take frequent essay type examinations and to write papers and reports that are thoroughly reviewed, critiqued, and graded by the faculty. Examinations should test the student's knowledge, his ability to think, and how well he can synthesize and articulate solutions, both oral and written. (Chapter V, No. 25, Panel Report pp. 169-70.)

Intermediate School Characterization

Implemented.

Status

Actions taken under this recommendation are discussed in recommendations 4 and 33.

Senior School Characterization

Partially Implemented.

Status

Actions taken under this recommendation are discussed in recommendations 4 and 33.

Recommendation Number 35

Distinguished Graduate Program

All PME schools should have distinguished graduate programs. These programs should single out those officers with superior intellectual abilities for positions where they can be best utilized in the service, in the joint system, and in the national command structure. (Chapter V, No. 26, Panel Report p. 170.)

Intermediate School Characterization

Implemented.

Status

Although the school designates a distinguished graduate, it does not employ a system of class rankings or an honor graduate program. School officials said that class rankings are not used because the concept is not

compatible with the adult learning model used by the school. However, it has a number of competitive programs that recognize academic excellence.

Distinguished Graduate Awards:

- Marshall Award (top U.S. officer)
- Pershing Award (top reserve component officer)
- Eisenhower Award (top international officer)

Academic Excellence Programs:

- Arter-Darby History Writing Award
- Father Don Smythe History Award
- Douglas MacArthur Military Leadership Writing Award
- Excellence in Command, Control, Computers, Communications, and Intelligence Writing Award
- Master Tactician and Master Logistician

Advanced Education Programs:

- Master of Military Art and Science
- Cooperative Degree Programs
- Advanced Military Studies Program

**Senior School
Characterization**

Not Implemented.

Status

The school does not rank the top percentile of graduates or identify officers for service, joint, or national command structure assignment. Two-thirds of the Army officers in the graduating class of 1989-90 were assigned in one of these areas. School officials stated a merit list is therefore neither desirable or necessary. Students are graded against criteria, not against each other. The objective is to meet or exceed the criteria, not achieve a basis of comparison with peers.

School officials said that selection is highly competitive. Only 6 percent of all eligible lieutenant colonels and colonels are chosen each year for resident attendance. Other reasons for not establishing a distinguished graduate program include the following:

- The strategic security environment for which the school is charged to prepare students is characterized by consensus-building, negotiation,

and a spirit of cooperation. This characterization is uniquely different from the students' original competitive environments.

- The subjects taught, such as national military strategy, are complex and difficult, with no clear-cut solutions. As at other graduate-level centers of learning, these subjects do not lend themselves to academic terms of distinction.
- School officials believe that their students are the "best and the brightest" colonels and lieutenant colonels in the Army. They are all career professionals in their respective fields. Most external cues that motivate young officers and young students have long since been replaced by internal motivators. The one external motivator that remains pervasive among these students is judgment by their peers. The combination of these two factors is powerful and explains what motivates students to learn here or at any senior level seminar or executive development program in industry.

Recommendation Number 36

Officer Efficiency Reports

The Chairman, JCS, and the service chiefs should give serious consideration to using officer efficiency reports rather than training reports for PME institutions. (Chapter V, No. 27, Panel Report p. 170.)

Intermediate School Characterization

Not Implemented.

Status

The school has no plans to use officer efficiency reports at this time. The school believes the present academic efficiency report provides better focus on student performance in an academic environment. In addition, the report, which the schools are required to use by the Army Department, becomes a permanent part of the officer's performance record maintained by the Army Department just like the officer efficiency report on operational assignments.

Senior School Characterization

Not Implemented.

Status

The school has no plans to use officer efficiency reports at this time. However, the school would use them if instructed by Army Department

Appendix I
Status of U.S. Army Command and General
Staff College and Army War College
Implementation of Panel Recommendations
on Professional Military Education

headquarters. School officials stated that the Army's officer efficiency report system is designed to measure performance in operational assignments and to include the potential for increased responsibility and promotion. The Army's academic evaluation report system is designed to measure the soldiers' degree of success within the Army's school system. The latter is tailored to meet the unique requirements of a school environment.

Major Contributors to This Report

**National Security and
International Affairs
Division, Washington,
D.C.**

George E. Breen, Jr., Assistant Director
Frank Bowers, Senior Evaluator
David E. Moser, Staff Evaluator
Meeta Sharma, Staff Evaluator

**Philadelphia Regional
Office**

Frederick P. German, Regional Management Representative
Jim Ungvarsky, Site Senior
Doug Sanner, Staff Evaluator

Glossary

Intermediate Service School

This is generally the third level of an officer's formal PME and officers with about 10 to 15 years of military experience attend one of the four intermediate schools. (These schools are the U.S. Marine Corps Command and Staff College in Quantico, Virginia; the College of Naval Command and Staff in Newport, Rhode Island; the U.S. Army Command and General Staff College at Fort Leavenworth, Kansas; and the U.S. Air Force Command and Staff College at Air University, Maxwell Air Force Base, Montgomery, Alabama.) An officer is usually at the major rank in the Army, Air Force, and Marine Corps or lieutenant commander in the Navy. At the intermediate level, the focus is on several branches of the same service as well as on the operations of other services.

Joint Professional Military Education

This education encompasses an officer's knowledge of the use of land, sea, and air forces to achieve a military objective. It also includes different aspects of strategic operations and planning, command and control of combat operations under a combined command, communications, intelligence, and campaign planning. Joint education emphasizes the study of these areas and others from the perspectives of the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps services.

Joint School

Joint PME from a joint perspective is taught at the schools of the National Defense University located at Fort McNair in Washington, D.C., and another location in Norfolk, Virginia. For the most part, officers attending a joint school will have already attended an intermediate and/or senior service school.

Joint Specialty Officer

An officer who is educated and experienced in the formulation of strategy and combined military operations to achieve national security objectives.

Operational Art

The employment of military forces to attain strategic goals in a theater of war or theater of operations through the design, organization, and conduct of campaigns and major operations.

Phase I

That portion of joint education that is incorporated into the curricula of intermediate and senior level service colleges.

Senior Service School

This level is normally attended by lieutenant colonels and colonels in the Army, Air Force, and Marine Corps and by Navy commanders and captains with about 16 to 23 years of military service. The senior service schools generally offer an education in strategy. (The four senior level schools are the College of Naval Warfare in Newport, Rhode Island; the Army War College at Carlisle Barracks, Pennsylvania; the Air War College at Air University, Maxwell Air Force Base, Montgomery, Alabama; and the Marine Corps Art of War Studies program in Quantico, Virginia.)

Service School

One of the individual Army, Navy, Air Force, or Marine Corps intermediate or senior PME institutions.

Strategy

National military strategy is the art and science of employing the armed forces of a nation to secure the objectives of national policy by applying force or the threat of force. National security strategy is the art and science of developing and using the political, economic, and psychological powers of a nation, together with its armed forces, during peace and war, to secure national objectives.