

AU/ACSC/008/1999-04

AIR COMMAND AND STAFF COLLEGE

AIR UNIVERSITY

TEACHING JOINT DOCTRINE IN THE NON-RESIDENT
PROFESSIONAL MILITARY EDUCATION ENVIRONMENT

by

Bradford R. Barnett, Major, USAF

A Research Report Submitted to the Faculty

In Partial Fulfillment of the Graduation Requirements

Advisor: Lt Col Deborah Beatty

Maxwell Air Force Base, Alabama

April 1999

Disclaimer

The views expressed in this academic research paper are those of the author(s) and do not reflect the official policy or position of the US government or the Department of Defense. In accordance with Air Force Instruction 51-303, it is not copyrighted, but is the property of the United States government.

Contents

	<i>Page</i>
DISCLAIMER	ii
PREFACE	v
ABSTRACT	vii
INTRODUCTION.....	1
Non-Resident Joint Professional Military Education	1
Goldwater-Nichols Act	6
Officer Professional Military Education Policy.....	8
NON-RESIDENT TEACHING OF JOINT DOCTRINE WITHIN PROFESSIONAL MILITARY EDUCATION SCHOOLS	10
Navy Command and Staff College	10
Non-Resident Correspondence	10
Non-Resident Seminar	11
Army War College.....	12
Army Command and General Staff College	14
Non-Resident Correspondence	14
Non-Resident Seminar	15
Air Command and Staff College.....	16
Non-Resident Correspondence	16
Non-Resident Seminar	16
Marine Corps Command and Staff College.....	17
Non-Resident Correspondence	17
Non-Resident Seminar	18
AF DISTANCE LEARNING OFFICE.....	20
AF NON-RESIDENT JOINT TRAINING COURSE	24
Summer Course.....	25
Bi-monthly Course.....	26
Adjunct Course	27
Funding Challenges	27
Other Challenges.....	28
CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....	30

GLOSSARY	34
BIBLIOGRAPHY	35

Preface

All services provide professional military education (PME) to both resident and non-resident students. The Department of Defense (DoD) Reorganization Act of 1986 (commonly known as the Goldwater-Nichols Act) directs the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff (CJCS) to enhance the education and training of officers in joint matters. Service schools are meeting the minimum requirements defined by the CJCS's Officer Professional Military Education Policy (OPMEP) in an environment of continuous high paced operations (OPSTEMPO). One way the services are trying to meet OPMEP requirements and adjust for the OPSTEMPO is to provide officers with an opportunity for interactive joint training and education. A problem lies, however, in the Air Force's solution for the future, distance learning. While distance learning is an excellent teaching method, it requires the student to spend free time viewing tapes and using a computer at home or in the base education office. While this appears on the surface as an excellent solution, it fails to provide students the opportunity to interact with other services. The other services provide this opportunity to their non-resident students to prepare them not only for joint assignment, but also to fill ad hoc Joint Task Force (JTF) staffs. This type of ad hoc staff is more prevalent in today's DoD. As the Air Force moves toward the Air Expeditionary Force (AEF) concept, its challenge is to provide qualified officers, trained and educated through the non-resident program, to work in joint staff positions and on ad hoc JTFs. The Air Force can achieve this through a short course for non-resident

students. The course will expose the students to joint lectures and direct interaction with members from the other services.

I would like to extend my sincere thanks to Lt Col Debbie Beatty, my faculty research advisor, for her guidance throughout this paper. Additionally, I am grateful to Lt Col Paul Moscarelli, LtCol Mark Wheeler, Dr. Adeline Cherry, and Dr. Jerry Boling, who provided substantial help developing the topic and guiding my research.

Abstract

All services provide professional military education (PME) to both resident and non-resident students. The Goldwater-Nichols Act directs the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff (CJCS) to enhance the education and training of officers in joint matters. The CJCS established the Officer Professional Military Education Policy (OPMEP) requirements to direct service schools to teach joint doctrine and joint operations within the PME curricula. Service schools are meeting the minimum OPMEP requirements in an environment of continuous high paced operations (OPSTEMPO). Currently, non-resident joint training and education is limited to reading textbooks about jointness. What is required is an opportunity for interactive joint training and education. The Air Force's solution for the future is distance learning. Distance learning is an excellent teaching method. However, it is deficient in providing the opportunity for students, enrolled in the non-resident correspondence and/or seminar program, to interact and learn from the other services. The other services provide this opportunity to their non-resident students to prepare them not only for joint assignment, but also to fill ad hoc Joint Task Force (JTF) staffs. This type of ad hoc staff is more prevalent in today's Department of Defense. As the Air Force moves toward the Air Expeditionary Force (AEF) concept its challenge is to provide qualified officers trained and educated through the non-resident program to work in joint staff positions and on ad hoc JTFs. The Air Force can provide this interaction through a short course for non-resident students. This course will expose

the students to joint lectures and direct interaction with the other services. Students will have face-to-face interaction with students and faculty from sister services in lecture and seminar formats. This paper details the history of the service schools' current non-resident requirements and curriculum plans. Highlights include how the Air Force meets non-resident requirements compared with other services. It also explores the issues and requirements of the Air Force's current solution for OPMEP requirements. Finally, it suggests all services need to develop parallel non-resident curricula that allow members from any service to receive PME credit for attending a sister service school. This enhances cross service training and education.

Chapter 1

Introduction

Non-Resident Joint Professional Military Education

The initial scope of this effort planned to look at the services' primary, intermediate, and senior levels of professional military education (PME). The focus has changed to the intermediate and senior levels due to the current changes taking place in the Air Force PME system. The Air Force is currently updating its PME curriculum for the primary level officer PME with a prototype course and a bottom-up review of both resident and non-resident curricula.

Earlier this fiscal year, the Air Force implemented its prototype course for 2nd Lieutenants called the Aerospace Basic Course and plans are in place for full implementation in fiscal year 2000. It is also in the process of evaluating and writing a new curriculum plan for the Squadron Officer School's (SOS) resident and non-resident programs. This paper's goal, with its findings, is to help focus the Air Force and other service schools to design their non-resident curricula to mirror their resident programs. Ultimately, more officers become schooled in the areas required to operate in a joint environment.

While several studies have taken place, none have focused on the requirements and issues surrounding the non-resident student and curriculum. Even the 1998 JPME 2010,

Phase I study did not focus on non-resident curriculum. Although, its purpose and charter was to conduct a comprehensive study to define joint PME requirements and identify an educational process/system that will prepare officers for current and future challenges, the focus centered on the services' resident programs.¹ Ultimately the study was to provide an overall review of the DoD's PME system to determine requirements, both current and evolving, and to identify shortfalls and limiting factors in the system. In conjunction with this overall review, several factors and assumptions must be taken into account.

For example, as DoD forces continue to shrink in size, the services need to work more closely and in conjunction with sister services and the nation's reserve component forces. In keeping with a "totally integrated force," the reserve component forces augment Joint Task Force headquarters as well as serve in other joint organizations.² Therefore, students enrolled in the non-resident programs come from each service's active duty force and their reserve component. This assumption must be taken into account when developing or analyzing non-resident PME programs for any service. In particular, we must understand the problems associated with the reserve component force. The time the reserve component forces use to serve their country is not only given up by their families, but by their primary employer. The service schools are fortunate to have in their resident classes several reserve component students each year. However, it is very difficult for a reserve component officer to complete the Air Force non-resident program in the time allotted (eighteen months). While active duty officers are very busy training in their specialty and are often on temporary duty away from home throughout the year, the reserve component forces are often involved in the same duties.

Additionally, the reserve component forces have a second full-time job often requiring training and temporary duty away from home. Both of these jobs require those forces to use more of their personal time to serve their country while maintaining their primary employment. In today's era, the Air Force must also account for this when developing curriculum for non-resident students.

The JPME 2010 study clearly identifies the need for officers to develop a working knowledge of joint concepts early in their careers. Furthermore, as the DoD uses ad hoc JTFs more frequently, the Air Force needs to ensure its officers are prepared to work on those ad hoc JTF staffs. This becomes a problem as the Air Force moves toward the AEF concept; the Air Force can not ensure the availability of officers trained in joint matters unless it does not honor the rotation theory for AEF forces. For example, a JTF for AEF #4 requires an officer with experience or training in a specific joint task or position, the only officer available to fill this is assigned to AEF #1. Consequently, the tasking goes out to task the officer from AEF #1. If we continually task these individuals, we defeat one of the purposes behind the AEF concept. The theory of the AEF concept is to provide Air Force members with a firm schedule of normal deployments thus trying to stabilize their quality of life.

To put it plainly, if the DoD continues with ad hoc JTFs, junior Air Force officers need a fundamental knowledge of JTF operations. Assignments to ad hoc JTFs are usually provided from service headquarters by grade and specialty required without consideration to their joint professional military education (JPME) background. Additionally, junior officers assigned to ad hoc JTFs have had little opportunity for

exposure to a joint environment unless through a previous assignment.³ Distance learning may be the vehicle to do this.

It is important to note three common terms describe distance learning in the non-resident PME system. The first term, distributed learning, is the use of common materials (lesson plans) at remote sites for adjunct faculty to teach the course. A second common term, distance learning, is the use of technology to transmit or receive lectures or curriculum at remote sites. Additionally, distance learning is often used to describe pedagogy outside of the formal school setting. Correspondence, the final term, is the use of materials sent to students; this type of learning provides limited student faculty interaction.

The OPSTEMPO/readiness issues will require distance learning to become part of a normal duty day. In order to achieve success in the non-resident PME arena, non-resident PME cannot be viewed as an “other duties as assigned” activity. It is not enough to make non-resident PME material available, it must be given the same priority as that established for readiness. Commands must give non-resident PME command emphasis and support as an active, on-going requirement, and allow its officers time to complete the courses during duty hours. Currently, supervisors and commanders emphasize enlisted PME, but do not place the same emphasis on officer education. In fact, supervisors often encourage enlisted members to develop a personal study plan to prepare for exams. Changing this paradigm for the officers, in the DoD, will be one of the greatest challenges. This does not mean we see a necessity to give our officers one day per week for study. Rather, we must allow them some time to study during office hours just as some supervisors do for exercise. In order to keep pace with rapid advances in

technology, officers need access to service/joint PME resources more frequently, but for shorter periods.⁴ Officers in high paced positions often do not have the free time available to accomplish PME. They spend a minimum amount of quality time with their families. Forcing them to spend free time on PME only exacerbates the retention problem.

Subsequently, this issue is exacerbated by the fact that as of 1 October 1989, at least fifty percent of each service's joint duty assignments must be filled by officers who have been designated as joint specialists or officers who have been selected as joint specialty officer (JSO) nominees. The JSO nominees are officers who have successfully completed both phases of JPME. The JPME process is a two-phased program. Phase I is taught as part of the curricula of the intermediate and senior service colleges. It emphasizes the fundamentals needed for a sound basis in joint operations, and it is intended to provide a foundation for follow-on study during Phase II. Phase II of JPME complements Phase I and is taught at the Armed Forces Staff College. Phase II emphasizes joint planning, operations, procedures, and perspectives. It is taught at the application level of learning and builds on the foundation developed in JPME Phase I.⁵ Further problems exist with officers from different services. Those who choose to take non-resident courses from a service other than their own will receive Phase I credit. However, their service may not grant them service specific PME credit at the intermediate or senior level. Consequently, proper preparation for Phase II must occur via limited selection to the services' resident programs in order to receive credit for both requirements. While on the surface this may not appear to cause problems, the Navy and Army currently have non-resident programs in place that rely on outside service officer

participation to incorporate joint issues and interaction in their curricula. These programs also reach beyond our borders; the Army War College's non-resident program will have its first international officer next year.⁶ These programs are well ahead of the Air Force programs in reaching out to incorporate joint and multinational issues in their curricula.

Goldwater-Nichols Act

If, as Services, we get too critical among ourselves, hunting for exact limiting lines in the shadow land of responsibility as between...[the Services], hunting for and spending our time arguing about it, we will deserve the very fate we will get in war, which is defeat.⁷

Dwight D. Eisenhower correctly foretold the path the US Armed Forces were to travel after the Vietnam War and through the early 1980s. In an effort to change paths and ease the lines between services, the US Congress passed the Goldwater-Nichols Act. As the DoD approaches the thirteenth anniversary of the Goldwater-Nichols Act, the Air Force is looking at how well its PME programs conform to the requirements outlined in the OPMEP.

The OPMEP outlines the policies and procedures necessary to fulfill CJCS PME responsibilities. It also addresses specific PME policies; assigns responsibilities for policy implementation; outlines the PME review process; outlines learning areas and outlines objectives that define JPME; and specifies the procedural aspects of the JPME policy.⁸

To fully understand the background and implications of this issue, one must first understand why Congress passed the Goldwater-Nichols Act. Before the Goldwater-Nichols Act, the DoD system was not known for service cooperation or joint doctrine implementation. This is based on a well-founded concern about the services' ability to

conduct and win joint operations in the field.⁹ The 1980 failed rescue attempt of hostages from the American Embassy in Iran was the culminating point for the US armed forces and highlighted their inability to conduct successful joint operations. Problems associated with operations in Grenada also hint at the US inability for successful joint operations. These occurred in the aftermath of the Vietnam War and the eventual drawdown of the DoD in the late 1970s and early 1980s. Following this drawdown there was a period of growth during the early 1980s. From this growth, and our failure to rescue the hostages, the armed forces began a move to reorganize and incorporate joint doctrine and training. Goldwater-Nichols was the turning point for joint training and PME. It was an effort to balance joint and service interests and perspectives in the DoD. It emphasized joint officer management and education of officers who serve in joint assignments or with joint institutions. Since 1986, the services have structured, over the past ten years, a major portion of PME curriculum around jointness and meeting OPMEP requirements.

One of the eight principal purposes of the Goldwater-Nichols Act was to improve joint officer management. One of the problems highlighted in the Senate Armed Services Committee report in 1985 was the amount of time officers spent in joint assignments. One can easily see that spending a relatively short amount of time in a joint assignment, once that officer learns the job, is not beneficial to the DoD. For example, in 1982, only two percent of officers on the joint staff had previous joint staff experience and only thirteen percent had attended the Armed Forces Staff College. Tour lengths were below thirty months. A study group convened by the CJCS in 1982, concluded that the combination of lack of experience, practical knowledge of joint activities, and formal

education in the joint school system, coupled with short tours, made it difficult for joint staff officers, no matter how capable, to deal effectively with joint issues.¹⁰ Today, the services can teach and prepare their officers to work and deal with joint issues through expanding the non-resident curricula.

Officer Professional Military Education Policy

It is essential that our Joint Professional Military Education programs provide warfighters with an understanding of strategic concepts in the future environment where military force will be applied, as well as an in-depth understanding of individual Service systems and how the integration of these systems enhance joint operations.¹¹

In the OPMEP, the CJCS shares his vision for the US military of the future to be an effective, joint organization based on dominant battlespace knowledge. In order to remain the preeminent force our nation expects, we must continue to develop our joint military education. This joint education will play an extremely important role in building the type of Armed Forces outlined in a Joint Vision 2010 (JV 2010).

The OPMEP identifies joint education as a career-long endeavor. More emphasis is put on joint doctrine, multi-national warfighting, and system integration. Specifically, the OPMEP identifies the responsibilities of the major PME institutions regarding the achievement of the goals set forth by the chairman. The OPMEP identifies learning objectives for each level of PME and the desired level of learning. Compliance is measured through the process for accreditation of joint education, which is assessed through an on-site accreditation reaffirmation review every five years.

The OPMEP also states that non-resident course curricula should parallel resident course curricula. It also specifies the services' ability to adjust non-resident courses to different teaching environments, methodologies, and available time. Each of these three

factors has come to pose problems for the service schools. Over the past few years and months, rapid changes in technology have developed several new environments and methodologies for teaching the non-resident curriculum. This, combined with the current force drawdown and high OPSTEMPO, has put the Air Force non-resident programs behind in development and implementation of the new technology. The force drawdown also effects the staffing at our schools. The resident programs receive high visibility through the guest lecture programs and visiting senior staff. Inherent in this type of visibility is the push to maintain the currency of the resident programs and the presentation of an up-to-date product. This is not the case with non-resident programs, which receive less priority and visibility. They are typically understaffed and the reduction in force only exacerbates this problem. In order to conduct a review of the Air Force programs, the other services' non-resident programs were used as a benchmark comparison.

Notes

¹ Joint Professional Military Education 2010 Study, Requirements Team Report for CJCS, 30 September 1998, Phase I of a multi-phase study.

² Ibid., JPME 2010 Study.

³ Ibid., JPME 2010 Study.

⁴ Ibid., JPME 2010 Study.

⁵ Joint Professional Military Education Handbook, ACSC, 1996.

⁶ David Birdwell, Army War College, Carlisle Barracks, interviewed by author, 4 January 1999.

⁷ Dwight D. Eisenhower, General of the Army, Supreme commander of Allied forces in Europe in World War II.

⁸ J-7, CJCSI 1800.01, United States, Joint Chiefs of Staff, Officer Professional Military Education Policy Washington, DC: Joint Chiefs of Staff, 1 March 1996.

⁹ Military Education for the 21st Century Warrior, Robert Goldich.

¹⁰ Military Education for the 21st Century Warrior, James R. Locher, III.

¹¹ Joint Chiefs of Staff, Joint Vision 2010, Gen John M. Shalikashvili

Chapter 2

Non-Resident Teaching of Joint Doctrine Within Professional Military Education Schools

We have got to be of one family, and it is more important today than it ever has been.

-Dwight D. Eisenhower

Navy Command and Staff College

The Naval Command and Staff College offers their non-resident curriculum to students by two methods. The first method is through a paper-based correspondence program. The second is through a seminar based non-resident program. While the correspondence program is similar to the Air Force correspondence program in these two respects, the similarity ends there.

Non-Resident Correspondence

The Naval correspondence program is strictly a paper-based version with allowances for some audiocassettes that are mailed directly to the students. These cassettes are typically lectures that the course director considers pertinent to a particular course. The audiocassettes are the exception rather than the norm. Students are given three years to complete the correspondence course and may start the course as a Lieutenant (0-3).¹ The Navy sees this as an opportunity to reach officers earlier in their career.

Non-Resident Seminar

The Naval non-resident seminar program is similar to the Air Force non-resident seminar program. In this program, students meet in a controlled seminar on a weekly basis just like the Air Force students. However, contract instructors teach the seminars in the naval program. The instructors are paid on average \$30,000 per year. The program is offered in nineteen permanent locations around the country.

In the seminar program, the class consists of eighteen to twenty students. Each seminar program's makeup consists of approximately one thousand civilians, reserve component forces, Navy, Army, Marine Corps, and Air Force students each year. The course is split into three phases; each phase takes one year to complete. Students are allowed breaks for other duty assignments that are not conducive to three consecutive academic years. For example, an officer who completes one year of school, and then goes to sea for two years is allowed to complete the last two years in seminar. Or, the officer may finish the program at sea, via correspondence. The course is accredited and students who complete all three years of the course are allowed twenty graduate credits toward a graduate degree. Each one-year course consists of class one night per week for thirty-two weeks. The class lasts three hours and the Navy will occasionally send guest speakers to the nineteen seminar locations. This course meets all Phase I PME requirements.

A major problem the Navy sees in its ability to keep the program joint in nature is the Air Force's reluctance to give Air Force PME credit to Air Force officers who choose to take the program. The Navy, on the other hand, recognizes sister service schools' non-resident programs for the Navy intermediate service school requirements. At this time, there is no incentive for Air Force officers to complete the Navy program other than for

Phase I credit because of an interest in learning more about the Navy in joint operations. Air Force officers still need to complete the Air Force's non-resident Air Command and Staff College (ACSC) program for Air Force PME requirements. The Air Force does allow its officers to receive intermediate service school credit if they attend in residence at a sister service's intermediate level school.² The Army and Marine Corps policies on this matter vary.

Army War College

The Army's War College (their senior school) offers their non-resident curriculum to students via a correspondence program, which divides the students into seminars. This gives the students the capability to communicate with other students in their seminar and/or with an instructor on the current course material. This communication can be either through normal telephone conversations, electronic mail or via on-line chat rooms.

The non-resident program takes two years to complete. There are ten courses, of which, students complete five each year. A unique program aspect is students are required to attend two resident courses, held each summer. Following the first year, students attend a two-week summer program, consisting of guest lectures and seminar discussions. They also participate in wargaming scenarios that incorporate joint doctrine. After completing the second year, the students return for more lectures, seminar discussions, and wargaming culminating in a graduation ceremony. The Army can run two classes at once with this format. One class will be in their first year with the other class in their final year.

Each class consists of approximately three hundred students from all services, the reserve components, civilians, and by AY2000, international students. The Army utilizes

their resident program facilities during the summer for the non-resident short course. The instructors for the non-resident, two-week courses are the same instructors that teach throughout the normal resident program. They have found this program ideal for their guard and reserve members as it has little effect on their lives outside the military. Often, the two weeks can count for their annual requirements.

The Army does plan to make some modifications to the program as it stands now. They want to encourage more international officers to take the course. However, as the program becomes more reliant on technology, they foresee some difficulties in this arena, as international officers may not have access to the required technology. Problems also arise when teaching an older generation to use computers and communicate in cyberspace. They also plan to change from two, two-week sessions, to a one-week introduction resident course to allow seminar members to place a face with a name and to train students on the use of the computer interface via the world wide web. Then after the first year, students attend the same two-week summer course followed by a one-week rap-up course and graduation following the second year. This change will allow them the ability to expand their program to run three consecutive classes each summer. For example, during the four-week summer period, the first group starts their first year with a one-week introduction course. The group that began a year earlier finishes its first year with a two-week course. Finally, the third group that started the program two years earlier completes a one-week course culminating in a graduation ceremony. This increases the number enrolled from six hundred to nine hundred students. This will still allow them to cycle the non-resident students through the resident portions during a one-month period each summer. Any officer eligible to attend senior service school can

enroll in the program. With this program as successful as it is, the Army is planning to bring a similar program on-line for their Army Command and General Staff College.^{3,4}

Army Command and General Staff College

The Army's Command and General Staff College offers their non-resident curriculum to students by two methods. The first method is through a correspondence-based program. The second is through a seminar-based program. The correspondence program utilizes printed text. The seminar program is the same program as the resident program at Leavenworth. Only officers selected for promotion to major or current majors may enroll. They recently completed an internal review and developed three goals to update the non-resident program. First, they plan to truly blur the non-resident and resident programs to a point that they mirror each other in all aspects, utilizing the resident curriculum for the non-resident program is the first step. The second goal is to develop their distance learning and take advantage of new Internet and automation technologies. Using this technology allows the school to continually update the non-resident program and maintain the mirror image. The third goal goes along with the first goal, to increase the rigor of the non-resident program. The course is taught in four phases.

Non-Resident Correspondence

The correspondence program is paper based at this time. While they want to utilize distance learning to a greater extent, they do not currently have specific ideas on how they will proceed other than to be web-based. Any major from the Army or other service

can take the correspondence program worldwide. Students have three years to complete the program. They may also switch to the non-resident seminar program.

Non-Resident Seminar

The seminar program is unique. It is the same program that is taught at Leavenworth, but reservists teach it. The program is taught within six regions in the continental US as well as Germany and Korea. Active duty officers, along with reserve component officers, meet in groups of ten or more one night per week or one weekend per month for eight months (inactive duty training classes). After this, they attend a two-week summer program, which is taught at three sites (active duty training classes). This schedule is repeated for the second year and if students stay with the seminar program, they will graduate in two years rather than three. The other services, via service representatives at Leavenworth, provide videos for training the seminar students. The current enrollment for both the non-resident correspondence and seminar programs is eight thousand. The three sites that teach the two-week active duty training class can handle two thousand total students each summer.

The instructors are reserve officers who meet the non-resident studies requirements for instructors. The reserve instructors receive faculty development training from Leavenworth.^{5,6} This program is ideal for their reserve component members as it has little effect on their lives outside the military. Often, the two weeks can count for their annual requirements. The Army does not recognize other sister service schools' non-resident programs for the Army intermediate service school requirements.

Air Command and Staff College

The Air Force's ACSC offers its non-resident curriculum to students by two methods. The first method is through a correspondence-based program. The second is through a seminar-based program. Each of these programs utilizes both a CD-ROM and printed text. A variation of the seminar program is a cyberseminar option for those wishing to take the course strictly via the Internet.

Non-Resident Correspondence

Students are given eighteen months to complete the correspondence course and may start the course only after selection to major. Currently over eighty-five hundred officers are enrolled in one of the two programs. Sister service officers represent 790 of the students and the school has over four hundred civilians in the program.

Non-Resident Seminar

The Air Force non-resident seminar program is the most basic of all the services. Students enrolled in this seminar program meet weekly at base locations worldwide or meet in the cyberseminar. Students teach each other using lesson plans developed by ACSC. The only time students receive instructor to student contact is if the student calls or e-mails an instructor with a question. Each seminar consists of several students. Typically, seminar size is kept at twelve to fifteen students. Several separate seminars may exist on each base and is dependent on student enrollment. The seminar courses are identical to those of the correspondence course. The students enrolled in the seminar program complete the program in approximately one year. The one-year cycle parallels that of the resident course at ACSC. However, the course material does not parallel the resident program. Students may switch from the seminar program to the correspondence

program at any time during the year; doing so will extend their allotted time to finish the program to a total of eighteen months.⁷ As stated earlier, the Air Force does not give its officers intermediate service school credit for completing a sister service's non-resident PME course.

Marine Corps Command and Staff College

The Marine Corps offers the non-resident program in both correspondence and seminar format. Current enrollment is approximately twenty-five hundred officers from various sources, which include: the Marine Corps, sister services, and DoD civilians, along with Marine Corps reservists. Out of this, eight hundred and thirty officers are enrolled in the seminar program. They also fielded a trial course, which was taught afloat a marine expeditionary unit/special operations capable (MEUSOC) returning from sea duty. During their two-week return to port, officers then completed one of the nine phases of the program.⁸ Only a few officers took part in this trial program. Due to the success of the program however, the Marine Corps plans to expand and continue the program for future students.

Non-Resident Correspondence

Students have five years to complete the correspondence program and several different methods of completion. The program consists of nine phases. All phases can be completed via the paper based correspondence program. Students also have the option of completing the Marine Corps planning process course via a web-based program or by attending a two-week resident program.⁹ Also similar to other services, students may complete the program in a seminar format.

Non-Resident Seminar

Students enrolled in the seminar program finish in two years. Students meet in seminars at one of seven campuses. Regional coordinators manage the instructors. Two out of the seven instructors are former instructors at the Quantico resident program. The other five instructors are retired Marine Corps officers who are graduates of the resident course. They bring jointness to the program through adjunct faculty from the local area. The adjunct faculty are former Marine Corps officers and graduates of either the resident or non-resident program. Another prerequisite for adjunct faculty is prior joint experience. The adjunct faculty often invites guest speakers from other services to supplement lessons adding to the jointness to the program. The school also manages a visiting scholar program. This program will either provide a functional expert in a given field to teach at each seminar campus or provide a video teleconference. Video teleconferences are currently used in several courses with an average of two used per course. The satellite campuses are currently contracted and paid for with funds from the Marine Corps Foundation and a visiting scholar program. This program is currently financed in next year's program objective memorandum (POM).

The resident program also provides a two-week summer program at Quantico that teaches the Marine Corps Planning Process course. They have 136 seats available with one-half going to the reserve component force and the other half for active duty Marines, civilians, sister services, and international officers. The current class has one international officer, but by 2000, the course will host five international officers.

Marine officers can complete sister service non-resident programs and receive credit for intermediate service school after completing course Four and Five of the Marine curriculum. Course Four covers the marine air ground task force (MAGTF) and course

Five covers the Marine Corps Planning Process.¹⁰ The Marine Corps values course Four and Five to such an extent that they require all their officers to complete these courses. This includes those officers that attend a resident school other than the Marine Corps Command and Staff College.

The Air Force's attempt at benchmarking the other services is through its central distance learning office, which coordinates the Air Force non-resident PME programs and develops technological solutions for the non-resident environment.

Notes

¹ Captain John E. Jackson, NWC College of Continuing Education, interviewed by author, 20 January 1999.

² Ibid., Captain John E. Jackson.

³ David Birdwell, Army War College, Carlisle Barracks, interviewed by author, 4 January 1999.

⁴ Lt Col Beverly Pointer, AWC, Maxwell AFB, interviewed by author, 25 January 1999.

⁵ Roth, Army Command and General Staff College, Leavenworth, interviewed by author, 27 January 1999.

⁶ Kathie Wagner, Army Command and General Staff College, Leavenworth, interviewed by author, 27 January 1999.

⁷ Lt Col Drake, ACSC, Maxwell AFB, interviewed by author, 27 January 1999.

⁸ Major Dave McMillan, MCU College of Continuing Education, interviewed by author, 25 January 1999.

⁹ Ibid., Major Dave McMillan.

¹⁰ Ibid., Major Dave McMillan.

Chapter 3

AF Distance Learning Office

The Air Force's Extension Course Institute (ECI), recently reorganized to include the Air Force Distance Learning office. This office develops distance learning for use throughout the Air Force and its educational institutions.

Three years ago, as part of the distance learning expansion effort, the Air Force Distance Learning office gave two hundred computers to education offices worldwide as seed computers for PME programs in development. A few commands such as Air Combat Command followed this initial effort by continuing the support of education offices with current technology. This technology, in the form of updated computer systems, allows programs, such as ACSC, to test students online at the education offices. It also ensures the availability of computers with sufficient speed and the capability to receive streaming video and access to the world wide web. This initial effort helped the education offices, but failed to reach every education office, leaving gaps in the system. Currently, the Air Force provides a minimum amount of streaming videos for students to view. One reason for this lies with the DoD's inability to protect the opinion of a video-taped speaker once the streaming video is released on the Internet. While guest lecturers are willing to speak freely in academic environments, speakers who are taped do not have

the same protection to freely share their views under the purview of academic protection that they have when speaking in a closed session.¹

The distance learning office views the Air Force's non-resident PME system for Air War College (AWC) and ACSC as weak. Current studies, reviewing the JPME system, show officers are not ready for the Phase II program for joint specialty officers after completion of these non-resident programs. This is the driving force behind the degree granting accreditation process for both schools. The distance learning office feels that revising the Air Force non-resident PME courses, in an effort towards accreditation, will then effectively prepare Air Force officers, who graduate from the non-resident programs, for Phase II PME. If the Air Force is successful in achieving civilian accreditation for their schools' programs, they must then look at whether the non-resident and resident programs will offer the same master's degree or different master's degrees. If students receive the same degree from both the resident and non-resident courses, then why send someone to the resident program after they complete the non-resident program?² To continue towards accreditation, the Air Force must require more instructor-student and student-student interaction.

Additionally, if Air University plans to grant a master's degree for the non-resident course, then the issue of whether or not an officer has a master's degree for promotion is taken out of consideration from all levels in the promotion process. In its place is the concept that PME, focusing on all issues, including joint warfighting, is what an officer needs to have for promotion. This will foster and build the profession of arms within and across the services, something that is at times lacking.

Currently there are electronic, web-based instruction solutions available and in use throughout the US in universities. The distance learning office has monitored or tested several of these systems. One such system, tested at Maxwell, required a hole through the base's security firewall for the system to function normally. Without a hole in the firewall, the system functions well outside the base computer network or solely within the base computer network. An attempt was made to access the system through the firewall and was ineffective. This poses a problem: base networks need to remain secure. A permanent hole in the base firewall is not an acceptable solution. The use of an off-base secure server does not solve this problem either; people require access to the secure server while on base and off base.

Distance learning in a civilian university setting differs from that in the DoD. The DoD initially thought that students communicate less with others in their class via e-mail or in chat rooms. However, civilian universities have found the opposite is true with their younger students who have grown up using computers in everyday life. They tend to communicate easier via a computer.³ Dr. Boling, Chief Distance Learning Technology Branch, does caveat this with the fact that DoD personnel need to build different and often long-term relationships with other students. The need to meet someone face-to-face is important in building those relationships. The Army found in their non-resident course that relationships build via computers, but once students meet in the two-week course, the relationship goes to a new level. For that reason, the Army is having the students meet for one-week prior to their first year.⁴ Until technology is available, and seamless on a worldwide basis, the Air Force may need to bring students together either in a resident seminar format or by using adjunct faculty at regional locations.⁵ If it is determined that

the Air Force will move toward a resident seminar or seminar taught by adjunct faculty, a determination must be made as to what subject matter will be captured for that portion of the course.

The option of teaching students in a resident seminar or with adjunct seminars poses additional problems. The Air Force needs to find facilities, determine how to pay for the instruction, and figure out how to teach the eight thousand to nine thousand students enrolled at any one time.⁶ While the Distance Learning office does not have any specific answers, the office is a clearinghouse of ideas and technology available from the civilian sector. As part of ECI, they not only need to foster technology for PME institutions; they must maintain the ECI network for base education offices around the world. If PME institutions go toward a technology-based system, it will drive the need for ECI to maintain the pace with current technology. With this in mind, the Air Force must not wait for answers from ECI; it must develop its own concepts and look to ECI for technology ideas. One solution is for the Air Force to develop a non-resident joint training course for its non-resident PME students.

Notes

¹ Dr. Boling, ECI, Distance Learning Office, Gunter Annex, interviewed by author, 11 January 1999.

² Dr. Cherry, ECI, Distance Learning Office, Gunter Annex, interviewed by author, 11 January 1999.

³ Dr. Boling, ECI, Distance Learning Office, Gunter Annex, interviewed by author, 11 January 1999.

⁴ David Birdwell, Army War College, Carlisle Barracks, interviewed by author, 4 January 1999.

⁵ Dr. Cherry, ECI, Distance Learning Office, Gunter Annex, interviewed by author, 11 January 1999.

⁶ Dr. Boling, ECI, Distance Learning Office, Gunter Annex, interviewed by author, 11 January 1999.

Chapter 4

AF Non-Resident Joint Training Course

The US military of the future must be an effective, joint organization based on dominant battlespace knowledge if we are to remain the preeminent force our nation expects. Joint Professional Military Education will play an extremely important role in building the type of Armed Forces outlined in a concept under development, Joint Vision 2010.

-Gen John M. Shalikashvili

The Air Force can meet the challenge of building the type of armed forces outlined in JV2010 and take a significant step toward accreditation by developing a resident short course for the non-resident program. Initially, students will either study the curriculum through correspondence or seminars, either at their base or via the cyberseminar. During their studies, students will attend a proposed four-week resident program. The following sections describe three options and the framework for the four-week resident course. Each of the three proposals is a viable option for students enrolled in either the seminar or correspondence course. Students attend either the summer resident program at Maxwell, the resident program offered six times each year at Maxwell, or they receive resident seminar instruction on a weekly basis from adjunct faculty at several locations. Each of these options has its advantages and disadvantages, but each option provides joint interaction for the non-resident student.

Summer Course

The first program, to be taught at Maxwell, consists of joint lectures and seminars similar in format to the current resident program. The course takes place during the summer break between the end and start of the ACSC and AWC resident programs. The course focuses on the joint warfighter. The lectures and seminars look at the different service roles and functions. The course also focuses on joint operations, similar to the joint operations course taught in residence, and culminates in a capstone wargame. This type of course is the most feasible. Several factors are in favor of this option.

First, the Air Force has the faculty and facilities available. Second, the non-resident seminar program students finish their fourth course and roll into a summer session. This allows for a seamless transition. Both AWC and ACSC facilities are available during this period. While this proposal is focused on ACSC, AWC may also consider something similar.

Two factors must be worked out to accommodate the student body for this course. First, quarters must be made available for six hundred students for the month. Currently, officer training school uses old dormitory space, but plans to vacate the old dormitory space after their complex is complete in December 1999. The second factor is money. Funding is not only an issue for the TDY involved for students, but funds are also required to renovate the dormitory space. Teaching materials are the same as those in use during the resident course. Squadron Officer School added a four-week summer course to its schedule in 1994 utilizing its instructors that teach the seven-week course throughout the year. Squadron Officer School instructors also supplement the Officer Training School staff during the summer, which requires those instructors to learn a new

curriculum. The transition for the ACSC faculty is seamless; they do not require spin-up time for curriculum they just finished teaching from the past year. Normally, during the summer break the ACSC faculty takes leave and prepares new curriculum for the coming resident school year. These can still take place during the summer break for most of the faculty; however a summer course requires those faculty that teach the summer course to take leave and prepare new curriculum either before or after its start. This option requires department head and senior staff coordination but is quite viable.

Bi-monthly Course

The second program also brings students to Maxwell for a four-week course. This second option allows us to reduce class size to two hundred students. Managing this number is much easier for billeting. It is offered six different times each year. This is similar to the seven-week TDY for Squadron Officer School students, which also occurs six times each year. This increases our yearly throughput by one hundred percent, to twelve hundred students. Combined with the six hundred or so resident graduates, over fifty percent of the Air Force officers in each year group, promoted to major, will receive advanced joint training and interaction in a resident format.¹ This percentage will increase as year groups continue to shrink in size.

The material covered in this course is the same as in the first option. Faculty support comes from our current operations or when ACSC expands its non-resident studies department, faculty support comes from that department. Facilities are available around Maxwell for instructional purposes. The auditoriums at SOS, ACSC, and AWC are not fully utilized each day. For the seminar portion, ACSC classrooms not in use will be utilized, (e.g., Following the ACSC morning seminar, the non-resident students attend

class in those same rooms in the afternoon). Students use their laptop computers (purchased with funds discussed later in chapter) for viewing course materials via a CD-ROM or accessing the Internet via the classroom connections. This already takes place when electives are held in various seminar rooms every Wednesday.

Adjunct Course

The third option encompasses hiring adjunct faculty or utilizing former faculty members in an adjunct role as an additional duty at their current duty station. With the push toward contracted services at each base, a high concentration of prior DoD personnel who may be available, based on experience, may choose to work for the contractors. We can easily draw from this experience base for an instructor force. This allows the Air Force to reach a broader portion of the officers in its command, thereby producing a higher number of graduates with the required level of joint expertise. While this produces a greater number of students, the costs are also higher. Again, the cost of operations comes into play. Not only are funds needed to pay instructors, but faculty development and continuation training must take place either at each location or at Maxwell.

Funding Challenges

So how does the Air Force pay for any one of these options? The other services were very creative in funding their programs. The Army and Navy sacrificed funds from within their intermediate service school budgets and received some help from their major commands. Their sacrifice stresses the importance they place on this type of program. The Marine Corps received funds from the Marine Corps Foundation and a visiting

scholar's fund. Portions of next year's POM funds, for the Marine Corps, are allocated to totally support the Marine program. With this in mind, if the Air Force implements one of these options, and receives civilian accreditation and degree granting authority, as they are currently pursuing, their through changes in current law, the Air Force may be able to use tuition assistance (TA) funds to pay for educating its officers and awarding a master's degree. If the Air Force implements this option, and officers participate in these programs then these same officers will not be authorized to utilize TA funds toward a master's degree from a civilian university.

Since all DoD schools are looking to technology for distance learning options, TA funds may permanently provide a laptop computer to meet course requirements for each officer enrolled. The officer pays his or her fair share of the cost for the computer as they already do for graduate courses at civilian universities (25 percent of cost). The student pays for access to the web via an on-line service. This resolves several of the technology problems identified by the distance learning office, which revolve around ensuring students have compatible computers and Internet access.

Other Challenges

Each of these options takes time for officers to accomplish. Since 1986, the number of officers in the Air Force has decreased, yet the OPSTEMPO has increased. An officer's time is a precious commodity. Allowing Air Force officers to start ACSC (non-resident) as captains helps alleviate this strain and answers the concerns of senior officers. A caveat to allowing officers to enroll as captains is successful completion of SOS. To accomplish this, captains enroll at their eight-year point or four years in grade.

This allows officers four years to complete SOS and three years to complete the ACSC non-resident course.

The JPME 2010 study Phase I conveyed the fact that senior officers need young officers with joint knowledge. It goes on to say that we need to teach our officers joint doctrine at a younger age.² The Navy allows its officers to start their non-resident intermediate service school as a Lieutenant;³ the Marines allow their officers to enroll in their non-resident program if the officer needs the training for a specific job.⁴ The Air Force Aerospace Basic Course teaches 2nd Lieutenants joint and service doctrine at a level equal to SOS. The focus of SOS is the four to seven year captain. This is the first step in developing officers at a younger age. The DoD is stuck in the conflict that young officers should focus on developing job knowledge with limited joint training. The DoD and the Air Force must not forget that its officers participate in more joint exercises and JTFs today than they did only a few years ago. The JTFs are common place and require young officers to fill staff positions.

Notes

¹ FY76-97 Officer Demographics, <http://www.afpc.randolph.af.mil>.

² Joint Professional Military Education 2010 Study, Requirements Team Report for CJCS, 30 September 1998.

³ Captain John E. Jackson, NWC College of Continuing Education, interviewed by author, 20 January 1999.

⁴ Major Dave McMillan, MCU College of Continuing Education, interviewed by author, 25 January 1999.

Chapter 5

Conclusions and Recommendations

Professional Military Education is critical to developing and maintaining an officer corps throughout the armed forces with collective attributes that make it capable of responding successfully to the challenges of the present and future national security environment.

-Archie Barrett

The JPME 2010 study Phase I clearly identified the need for officers to develop a working knowledge of joint concepts early in their careers. Furthermore, as the DoD uses ad hoc JTFs more frequently, the Air Force needs to ensure its officers are prepared to work on those ad hoc JTF staffs. This becomes a problem as the Air Force moves toward the AEF concept; the Air Force can not ensure the availability of officers trained in joint matters unless the Air Force does not honor the rotation of AEF forces. If the DoD continually task the same individuals, they defeat one of the purposes behind the AEF concept. The AEF concept provides Air Force members with a firm schedule of normal deployments.

To put it plainly, if the DoD continues with ad hoc JTFs, junior Air Force officers need a fundamental knowledge of JTF operations. Assignments to ad hoc JTFs are usually provided from service headquarters by grade and specialty required without consideration to their JPME background. Additionally, junior officers assigned to ad hoc

JTFs typically have little opportunity for exposure to a joint environment unless through a previous assignment.¹

In the JPME 2010 study Phase I, senior leaders voiced their opinions regarding JTF operations. Specifically the JTF planning and execution, embedded in Crisis Action Planning, is complicated by the fact that many of the officers assigned to ad hoc JTFs have little or no joint education or prior joint planning experience. A consensus thought that JTFs were the engagement tool of the future and that JTF education needs to start at a lower grade and become more robust as the officer progresses. To resolve this potential problem the Air Force has several options available.

The Air Force continues to work toward meeting its educational requirements through technology, but it needs to overcome the problems technology poses in meeting joint requirements. The other services are meeting this joint educational need through other means. The Air Force needs to look for alternatives to technology that will bridge the current gap, while it continues to develop technology options. In order for this to occur, several things must take place: allow officers to receive PME credit for any service's non-resident program, provide joint participation in the Air Force non-resident program, utilize sister services to build lesson plans on their service, and adopt a non-resident short course.

There is currently parochialism about one's own PME system. Allowing its officers to receive credit for attending the other services' non-resident PME programs alleviates some parochialism. The CJCS currently awards Phase I credit to any officer who graduates from any of the services' PME non-resident or resident programs certified through its process for accreditation of joint education. If all the non-resident programs

meet these requirements, then graduating from any service's non-resident program should give a service member credit. The Air Force needs to take the first step towards this, as they are the only service that does not provide joint interaction within its non-resident curriculum.

The first step in attracting other services' officers is to allow Air Force officers to receive credit for sister service's non-resident PME. Following this, it is necessary for the Air Force to enhance its own PME programs to increase joint interaction. This will have a two-fold effect. The ECI sees a need for more instructor-student and student-student interaction for Air Force PME to become accredited. If the course includes the right mix of joint speakers, it will not only accomplish the required interaction, but also attract the other services and their officers.

A further step that all services must take is to allow the primary service to develop lesson plans for their core missions and capabilities. In other words, rather than the Air Force developing a lesson on Marine Expeditionary Units, the Marine Corps College of Continuing Education develops the lesson. Sister services are then able to tailor the lesson for a given speaker or series of speakers. This is an example of what the Military Education Coordination Conference has tried to do in the past, but, it too, has run into roadblocks from the service schools.²

Adopting the non-resident joint training course enables the Air Force to meet the challenges of the present and future national security environment. Of the three options presented, Air Force implementation of the second option requires a minimum amount of funding and impact on current operations. If implemented and scheduled correctly, option two can incorporate option one into the class offered during the summer. The

second option also allows the service to increase the throughput of highly qualified officers to work joint matters when called upon. This enables the Air Force in maintaining its ability to staff ad hoc JTFs as it moves toward AEF operations. It is very apparent that the Air Force is not maintaining an educational edge in DoD. If it continues down this path without changing course, we will continue to fall behind the other services.

Notes

¹ Joint Professional Military Education 2010 Study, Requirements Team Report for CJCS, 30 September 1998.

² Dr. Boling, ECI, Distance Learning Office, Gunter Annex, interviewed by author, 11 January 1999.

Glossary

ACSC	Air Command and Staff College
AEF	Air Expeditionary Force
AWC	Air War College
AY	Academic Year
CJCS	Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff
DoD	Department of Defense
ECI	Extension Course Institute
JPME	Joint Professional Military Education
JTF	Joint Task Force
JV2010	Joint Vision 2010
MAGTF	Marine Air Ground Task Force
MEUSOC	Marine Expeditionary Unit/Special Operations Capable
OPMEP	Officer Professional Military Education Policy
OPSTEMPO	High paced operations
PME	Professional Military Education
POM	Program Objective Memorandum
SOS	Squadron Officer School
TA	Tuition Assistance
TDY	Temporary Duty
US	United States

Bibliography

- AFOATS Report to Chairman of Joint Chiefs of Staff. AFOAS, Air University 1997
- Air Command and Staff College. *Joint Professional Military Education Handbook*. Air University 1996
- Air Force Air Command and Staff College Course Description, Available from <http://www.acsc.au.af.mil/acsc/distance/distance.htm>
- Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff. *A Strategic Vision for the Professional Military Education of Officers in the Twenty-first Century*. Report of the Panel on Joint Professional Military Education of the Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff. March 1995
- Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff. *Process for Accreditation of Joint Education*. Report of Air Command and Staff College (Nonresident Program). June 1997
- Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff. *Process for Accreditation of Joint Education*. Report of Air Command and Staff College (Resident Program). June 1997
- Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff. *Process for Accreditation of Joint Education*. Report of College of Continuing Education, Naval War College. September 1998
- Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff. *Process for Accreditation of Joint Education*. Report of Joint and Combined Warfighting School. January 1998
- Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff. *Process for Accreditation of Joint Education*. Report of Marine Corps Command and Staff College (Nonresident Program). January 1997
- Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff. *Process for Accreditation of Joint Education*. Report of Marine Corps Command and Staff College (Resident Program). January 1997
- Conference on Military Education for the 21st Century Warrior*. 15-16 January 1998, Monterey CA. <http://web.nps.navy.mil/FutureWarrior>
- Education Technology in Support of Joint Professional Military Education in 2010: The EdTech Report*, R. Thomas Goodden, DPA, Joint Staff
- Implementing the Skelton Panel's Recommendations and Identifying Dimensions of Importance for the Future of Military Education: Insights*, January 1999, Available from <http://web.nps.navy.mil/futurewarrior/presentations/beachamp/tsld001.htm> through tsld006.htm
- J-7, CJCSI 1800.01. United States. Joint Chiefs of Staff. *Officer Professional Military Education Policy*. Washington, DC: Joint Chiefs of Staff, 1 March 1996
- Joint Duty Assignments*, Available from <http://www.colonels.hq.af.mil/pages/joint-duty.assignments.shtml>
- Joint Officer Information*, Major Harris, January 1999, Available from <http://charly.afpc.randolph.af.mil/jom/jso.info.htm>
- Joint Professional Military Education 2010 Study*. Requirements Team Report for CJCS. 30 September 1998
- Marine Corps War College Course Description, Available from <http://www.mcu.quantico.usmc.mil/mcwar/organ.htm>

Non-resident options for PME, Available from <http://www.npt.navy.mil>
Squadron Officer School Report to Chairman of Joint Chiefs of Staff. SOS, Air University 1997
Strategic Assessment Center. *Professional Military Education and the Emerging Revolution in Military Affairs*. Washington, DC: 1995
The Center for Strategic & International Studies. *Professional Military Education: An Asset for Peace and Progress*. Washington, DC: CSIS 1997
The Goldwater Nichols Act – Managing the Defense Department, Colonel John Osgood, Available from <http://pw2.netcom.com/~jrosgood/w16.htm>
Unification of the US Armed Forces: Implementing the 1986 Department of Defense Reorganization Act, Douglas C. Lovelace, Jr., August 1996, Available from <http://carlisle-www.army.mil/usassi/ssipubs/pubs96/>
United States. Joint Chiefs of Staff. *Concept for Future Joint Operations - Expanding Joint Vision 2010*. Washington, DC: Joint Chiefs of Staff, 1997. Available from <http://www.dtic.mil.80/doctrine/jv2010/jvpub.htm>
United States. Joint Chiefs of Staff. *Joint Vision 2010*. Washington, DC: Joint Chiefs of Staff, 1996. <http://www.dtic.mil.80/doctrine/jv2010/jvpub.htm>
United States. Quadrennial Review Document
US Code, Title 10. *Goldwater-Nichols Act of 1986*. United States. Joint Chiefs of Staff. Available from http://www.dtic.mil/jcs/title_10.html