

ART OF WAR STUDIES
MILITARY ISSUES PAPER

PROFESSIONAL FACULTY DEVELOPMENT IN THE
MILITARY EDUCATION SYSTEM

MARINE CORPS UNIVERSITY
MARINE AIR-GROUND TRAINING AND EDUCATION CENTER
MARINE CORPS COMBAT DEVELOPMENT COMMAND
QUANTICO, VIRGINIA 22134-5050

SUBMITTED IN FULFILLMENT OF THE
MILITARY ISSUES RESEARCH PROJECT
BY

O. J. FINK, JR
LTCOL USMC

Report Documentation Page				Form Approved OMB No. 0704-0188	
Public reporting burden for the collection of information is estimated to average 1 hour per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to Washington Headquarters Services, Directorate for Information Operations and Reports, 1215 Jefferson Davis Highway, Suite 1204, Arlington VA 22202-4302. Respondents should be aware that notwithstanding any other provision of law, no person shall be subject to a penalty for failing to comply with a collection of information if it does not display a currently valid OMB control number.					
1. REPORT DATE 2008		2. REPORT TYPE		3. DATES COVERED 00-00-2008 to 00-00-2008	
4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE Professional Faculty Development in the Military Education System				5a. CONTRACT NUMBER	
				5b. GRANT NUMBER	
				5c. PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER	
6. AUTHOR(S)				5d. PROJECT NUMBER	
				5e. TASK NUMBER	
				5f. WORK UNIT NUMBER	
7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) United States Marine Corps Command and Staff College, Marine Corps University, 2076 South Street, Marine Corps Control Development Command, Quantico, VA, 22134-5068				8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER	
9. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES)				10. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S ACRONYM(S)	
				11. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S REPORT NUMBER(S)	
12. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY STATEMENT Approved for public release; distribution unlimited					
13. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES					
14. ABSTRACT					
15. SUBJECT TERMS					
16. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF:			17. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT Same as Report (SAR)	18. NUMBER OF PAGES 21	19a. NAME OF RESPONSIBLE PERSON
a. REPORT unclassified	b. ABSTRACT unclassified	c. THIS PAGE unclassified			

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

TITLE: FACULTY DEVELOPMENT IN THE PROFESSIONAL MILITARY EDUCATION (PME) SYSTEM

I. Theme: One consequence of the Defense Reorganization Act of 1986 (Goldwater-Nichols) is an increased emphasis on Professional Military Education (PME). Consistent with quality education is a quality faculty; and a necessary ingredient for attracting, hiring, and maintaining a high quality staff of educators is the existence of a meaningful and challenging Faculty Development Program (FDP).

II. Thesis: Establishment of the Marine Corps University (MCU), and implementation of two new PME programs, the Senior Level School equivalent "Art of War Studies", and the second year Intermediate Level School "School of Advanced Warfighting" are demonstrative of the Marine Corps' commitment to the Joint PME arena. Attaining and maintaining quality military and civilian educators is consistent with the development and initiation of a comprehensive FDP within MCU.

III. Discussion: There does not currently exist within MCU a formally established FDP. There is a pressing requirement for a quality program that addresses the varying professional needs of both military and civilian faculty members. An effective program should provide the newly joined faculty with a "phased" approach to professional development. I contend three Phases are necessary and implementable at MCU. Phase I, "Preparation" consists of orientation, curriculum overview and instructional methodologies; Phase II, "Development" details unique course/curriculum development, subtleties of "active" learning in the conference group setting, and enhancing background readings germane to the overall program; and Phase III, "Enrichment" (lasting throughout a staff tour) affords the opportunity to attend symposia, conferences, exercises, etc, as well as research, writing, and publishing of material appropriate to individual faculty members' professional credentials. Such an FDP would apply to faculty from resident schools throughout MCU, and would be appropriately representational of the various curriculums. Academic Year 1991-1992 could be the "watershed" year for working out details and planning, with all Phases implementable by summer 1992.

IV. Conclusion: Any credible 'whole' is only as good as the 'parts' that comprise it. If PME at MCU is to be a credible 'whole', then an essential 'part' must be an effective Faculty Development Program. It should begin when a member joins the staff, and continue throughout the educator's tour; and the appropriate implementation vehicle is MCU. Unlike other 'parts' of the PME 'whole', implementation of a worthwhile FDP isn't contingent upon future initiatives, or significant increases in budget, manpower, or facilities. It only depends upon a commitment to get started and make it happen. There are ample models from which to structure a point of departure, and this paper presents one such approach.

Introduction

Given the reality of a shrinking defense budget, the military services, are preparing to "do more with less", and make every 'expenditure'- be it monetary, consumable asset or manpower hour, go further and count for more. Nowhere is this more apparent than in the arena of Professional Military Education (PME). There is increased pressure on the military's PME process to run first rate, world class institutions of higher learning that turn out top quality thinkers and professional prosecutors of warfighting. One need look no further than the emphasis given the report by the Armed Services Committee Panel on Military Education Report, popularly referred to as the "Skelton Report", to confirm this premise.

While every service has its own precise definition of the PME process and the product it purports to turn out, the Marine Corps' philosophy is best summed up in FMFM-1:

"Professional military education is designed to develop creative, thinking leaders.." ¹

The Commandant expanded on this theme in his training and education guidance to the Marine Corps Combat Development Command (MCCDC) upon its formal establishment in the fall of 1988, when he said:

"My intent in PME is to teach military judgment rather than knowledge....I want Marine NCOs and officers who know how to think about--and in war, who know how to conceptualize and engagement, a battle, and a campaign and then execute the concept....As education progresses from The Basic School through Command and Staff College, the material should grow more complex but the essence remain the same: teaching officers.....how to win in combat by out-thinking as well as out-fighting their opponents." ²

I contend there are two principle issues involved: (1) that USMC PME must teach warfare; and (2) that the 'teachers' areas important to the process as the process itself. It goes without saying that there are many facets within both issues.

The Marine Corps has taken decisive steps toward creating a PME process that achieves the Commandant's intent. Establishment of the Marine Corps University (MCU) and the reorientation of various schools' curricula to reflect the recommendations and mandates of the Skelton Report and the Goodwater-Nichols Act are central to this effort. I feel the next critical step, and the focus of this paper, is to ensure the 'teachers' are the best qualified available to execute this necessary task. In the words of Senator Skelton's report:

"The importance of a competent, credible, and dedicated faculty to the fabric and reputations of our PME institutions cannot be overstated."³

The limited scope of this paper cannot address all the issues associated with the recent initiatives underway throughout the PME arena. Precisely because such initiatives are so widespread and diverse, the one area having the most potential to have the greatest positive impact across the board is the faculty, both military and civilian. Attendant to a quality faculty is the existence of a vibrant and challenging Faculty Development Program (FDP) It's recognized that if didactics (pedagogy in Skelton Report parlance)- the art, science and profession of teaching- are to be effectively administered at PME schools, the faculty must include both accomplished civilian educators and experienced, operationally competent, officers.

By edict, DOD and the services are charged with ensuring PME

schools are stressing 'jointness' as well as strategic thinking. Indeed, Goldwater-Nichols goes into this in great detail. The Marine Corps Command and Staff College (CSC) has undergone a thorough curriculum restructuring in order to meet the tenets and recommendations set forth in the Skelton Report. The point being, such a diverse curriculum can best be administered by a faculty with diverse expertise, and this is best facilitated by a healthy civilian/military mix of professional educators.

This paper will focus on the CSC faculty process, but do so within the context of Marine Corps University, for the MCU is charged with the overall Marine Corps PME process. MCU should serve as the umbrella organization that can bring overarching credence to the faculty development process. Through examination of faculty development, both current and proposed, my scope will encompass the elements inherent in an effective FDP, with the understanding that faculty requirements differ from MCU school to school (ie, Command & Staff College, Amphibious Warfare School, and Communications Officers School, etc.), yet all support the 'warfighting' theme set out in FMFM-1.

CURRICULUM

What is it that the faculty is charged with imparting to the sometimes unwitting student body? As previously alluded to, this will vary from school to school, but will focus on succeeding in warfare. The study of warfare should be woven throughout the curriculum. Included would be examination of combat histories, with both student and faculty conducting research to rediscover, or uncover, various

truths about the art of warfare. Practical exercises that emphasize decision making are a logical accompaniment to the process. For CSC, the intent of the curricula is:

"To provide officers with an understanding of the interrelationships of the strategic, operational, and tactical levels of war within the joint/combined environment and, by adapting doctrine and techniques to the changing conditions of warfare, the ability to out-think and out-fight any opponent."⁴

The curriculum development process is one that is carried out by the faculty, which dictates that certain areas of expertise are a necessity. For CSC, the civilian professor complements the Theory and Nature of War, and Strategic Thought curriculum packages which emphasize historical study and review. Conversely, the experience and background of the military instructor complements the Operational Art and Marine Air Ground Task Force Education packages. It goes without saying that the curriculum development, review; and revision process is largely reflective of faculty input, and therefor a quality curriculum depends upon a quality faculty. Just like the curriculum needs maturity, so does the faculty.

FACULTY

The first and foremost "...bedrock of a quality professional military education"⁵ is the faculty. There are numerous considerations relative to faculty; civilian/military mix, professional qualifications, personal PME experience, and selection/hiring, to mention a few. All are important and play a role in the overall faculty equation. It's universally accepted that the faculty member in today's military institutions has to be

not only an effective teacher and instructor, but also a subject matter expert in his course/curriculum package. The credibility of the faculty member must be beyond reproach. Given the unique difficulties associated with the military faculty member, ie maintaining MOS proficiency despite perishable skills, the dynamics of evolving FMF doctrine, tactics, etc, makes the existence of a program that facilitates his staying proficient not only highly desirable, but a virtual necessity. There currently does not exist a structured, focused faculty development program within MCU. That's not to say that there aren't genuine opportunities for faculty 'enrichment' that are condoned by the various schools. There certainly are, but they're more appropriately identified with the 'training opportunity' category than the true 'faculty development' category. I consider 'bootstraps' and the summer 'workshop' held by CSC to be more course preparation than faculty development. Prior to discussing the tenets of a 'development' program, a brief discussion relating to the peculiarities of civilian and military faculty members is relevant.

In the case of both civilian and military professional, there needs to be an incentive for coming into the PME arena. Nowhere are incentives more important than at Marine Corps schools, which by reputation are given to emphasize more brawn than brain! A professional development process is, in and of itself, important to the civilian educator. The norm at civilian institutions is likely

“...for the beginning teacher to be assigned as 'teaching associates' with minor teaching loads in less critical areas, then take on more responsibilities according to demonstrated abilities.”⁶

Since the luxury of an 'apprentice' year isn't realistic in the PME world, there is a need to attract more qualified, experienced professors, who naturally will have a demonstrated interest in maintaining his teaching credentials and reputation. A dilemma applies equally to the military officer, who will possess solid MOS skills, but in all likelihood has little or no graduate level teaching experience, and who doesn't necessarily need to 'maintain' teaching skills, but to 'develop' them. An effective FDP should serve both civilian and military dimensions while enhancing their professional stature and credibility. According to the Skelton Report,

"Many civilian educators would relish the opportunity to teach, research, and write at a first rate PME institution. However, to be first rate, it's imperative that those institutions have an atmosphere that promotes academic freedom and encourages critical, scholarly research"⁷. Likewise, relating to military faculty, the report says; "...faculty duty for military officers must be seen by everyone in the services...as important, desirable, and rewarding."⁸

All roads, whether civilian or military, lead to the conclusion that establishment of a dynamic and evolving FDP at MCU is a must.

How do other PME institutions do it? Research indicates most intermediate and senior level institutions have a specific faculty development process ranging from initial orientation to structured educational opportunities. To illustrate, the Air University has a resident three and a half week Academic Instructor School for all faculty assigned to their intermediate level school (ILS- Air Command & Staff

College), and a subject matter tailored orientation course for senior level (Air War College) faculty. The U.S. Army's ILS course (Command & General Staff College) provides an initial instructor training course, and also has a faculty enrichment program conducted in conjunction with the Kansas Center Regional Council on Higher Education. The Naval War College conducts a faculty development program that includes symposia at other academic institutions, and professional conferences at both other academic institutions as well as the college itself.

The Marine Corps does have instructional training resident within the Marine Air Ground Training and Education Command (MAGTEC) at the Instructional Management School (IMS), but it isn't suited in it's present configuration to meet the requirements of full scale faculty development for various PME (CLS/ILS/TLS) levels. The Skelton Report includes a recommendation pertaining to faculty development programs which states,

"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 that 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."⁹

While I consider this a valid recommendation, it really focuses more on the preparation of a faculty member to join an institution than it does continuing their professional development and

enrichment once established on the faculty. The recommendation also has obvious application to the civilian faculty member as well, whether he is a new join to the PME arena or already established. Marine Corps CSC's response to this recommendation identifies the establishment of the Art of War Studies Program (MCWAR) and its follow-on faculty assignment for graduates; individual tutoring of new instructors by Problem Directors; and a summer one week workshop for discussing upcoming AY requirements, as having attained an "implemented" status of this recommendation. While contributory to the education process, these activities fall short of providing the 'full program' approach which constitutes a true faculty development program, and reinforces my contention that there is a focus on 'preparing' for arrival, with less emphasis given to the 'in-residence' status.

Notwithstanding the other variables associated with 'faculty', such as civilian/military mix, faculty to student ratio, and selection/hiring criteria, I contend that a Faculty Development Program begins upon selection for a position at MCU and continues until eventual departure from the staff. I recognize that the onus of responsibility for professional improvement is on the individual, be it civilian professor or military officer, but I also believe there is an institutional responsibility to facilitate the process to the mutual benefit of both faculty member and MCU.

THE FACULTY DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

An intensive FDP is one of the most important factors impacting on educational quality and effectiveness. To be truly effective in

the classroom, all instructors need to acquire a thorough understanding of both their subject matter and how it relates to the core curriculum. It's appropriate to evaluate (and test) not only the validity of the FDP, but also that of the faculty as well, thus ensuring consistent quality and effectiveness of both program and personnel. The FDP should enhance the faculty member's credibility and professionalism throughout his tenure on the faculty.

To facilitate a comprehensive USMC program that provides maximum benefit to all faculty, it should be sponsored by MCU. This is logical not only for practical reasons such as facilities, budget, and manpower, but more importantly for the philosophical considerations which will enhance consistent espousal of warfighting philosophy and tactical doctrine.

To this end, I submit that an effective FDP should have three phases: (1) Preparation Phase, (2) Development Phase, and (3) Enrichment Phase. The actual length of each phase would be the subject of further analysis, but could easily be accommodated in a time period consistent with established programs at other PME institutions (two to four weeks).

PHASE I: PREPARATION

This phase of the FDP would apply to all inbound instructors to MCU, regardless of school or whether civilian or military, It would largely be 'orientation' in terms of emphasis and center on the following topics:

Part I Orientation Block

- Welcome to Quantico
- USMC warfighting philosophy (FMFM-1)
- MCU and the DOD PME process

- Organization of MCU to support the mission; policies, guidelines and procedures
- MCU within MCCDC

Part II Mechanical Block

- Teaching techniques appropriate for the MCU audience
- The tools available to teach (audiovisual aids, graphics, etc.)

Ideally, the inbound instructor will have already experienced good teaching, but if not, then at least the FDP will expose him to some tried and proven instructional techniques. At the conclusion of Phase I, the goal will be for the newly joined faculty member to be familiar with his physical/geographic world, and the facilities aboard MCB to support him. He should also have a good understanding of the Marine Corps' emphasis on warfighting, and the PME emphasis on winning in combat, as well as strategic thought. The level of execution will vary from school to school, but the focus will be the same - excellence on the battlefield. The underlying purpose of Phase I is to send all new faculty members forward with a common understanding of the USMC PME arena.

PHASE II: DEVELOPMENT

Due to the difference in individual school missions, this phase of FDP will be executed based upon the specific school to which a faculty member will be assigned. Aware of the PME architecture within MCU, and of the individual school assigned, the faculty member will be exposed to the unique requirements of supporting his subject matter/curriculum. The literal substance of the school curriculum will be reviewed so that the appropriate teaching

techniques can be highlighted. It's during this phase that specific workshops would be held concerning active learning techniques, and effective conference group teaching. There is a direct relationship between classroom instruction and overall course instruction. In order for the new faculty member to be effective early on, it's necessary that he understand not only his subject matter, but also how it fits into the larger curriculum. Selected readings, syllabus review, and tutorials with current faculty members are important. The new faculty should prepare and deliver short lectures and abstracts for critique of content and delivery, thereby enhancing both his personal expertise as well as his ability to evaluate future student effort. The current practice at CSC of conducting "bootstraps" prior to the commencement of a particular package, is considered supplemental to the knowledge gained during Phase II of the FDP.

At the conclusion of Phase II, the new faculty member, in addition to the information gained from Phase I, will be thoroughly familiar with the particular duties associated with his faculty assignment. He'll have the broad perspective, yet a subject-matter focus. He'll understand the subtleties and techniques of teaching in the highly interactive atmosphere of the conference group setting. Further, he'll have read and be familiar with selected professional readings that are germane to the overall core curriculum, instead of trying to stay one or two days ahead of the students, as is now often the case. It's at this point that the new faculty member is ready to join the PME staff.

PHASE III: ENRICHMENT

The Military Education Policy Document (MEPD) states:

"The continued success of an institution is highly dependent on the professional growth of the faculty and staff."¹⁰

Extending, ideally, over the faculty member's entire tour, the Enrichment process should include: exchange opportunities for deserving faculty with the National Defence University and the Naval and Military Academies; attendance at the many subject-matter expert in-services held in the Washington D.C. area; and participation in relevant symposia, conferences, and field exercises. These activities should not be cost prohibitive due to geographic proximity, and would be invaluable in keeping faculty members up to date on various issues of their professional interest. Resident expertise within MCU could also be tapped to facilitate in-house discussion seminars on current issues of specific interest to the university. It's from these types of sources that information is infused into the curriculum and make it a real-world and dynamic program.

Naturally it would be incumbent upon MCU to release time and funds as appropriate to support faculty enrichment. The return received from faculty participation in such professionally enhancing events would far outweigh any attendant costs.

IMPLEMENTATION OF A FDP

Once the commitment has been made to establish a FDP, the next hurdle is implementation. As previously stated, this planning should fall under the overall cognizance of MCU, with individual schools within the University having responsibility for those areas directly related to their course and curriculum. The vehicle for

the Phase I and II portions need be identified and planned for. There is potential for facility and instructional support from the Instructional Management School (IMS) at Quantico, such as video-taping and graphics support. Guest lectures by accomplished speakers/teachers (such as Dr. Lawrence Lerer, Professor of Education at the Defense Systems Management college, Ft. Belvoir, VA.) could easily be facilitated, and would add credibility to the faculty preparation process. Individual schools within MCU could easily generate course/curriculum briefings for broad area introduction. I feel the entirety of Phases I and II could be generated and executed within the next academic year and once established could be readily continued by MCU staff. Phase III, Enrichment, needs to be implemented as a 'stand alone' portion of FDP. It should be a highlight for the professional educator, and serve as a 'magnet' for the motivated, professional faculty applicant. Coordination of letters of agreement with local area PME and civilian institutions for exchange opportunities; conduct of symposia and in-services; and invitations to guest lecturers, should be a collateral duty for one of the civilian educators at MCU, and such efforts formalized into a standing program.

RELATED CONSIDERATIONS

There are several related considerations that will impact on a FDP at MCU. They are discussed here for information and will need closer analysis prior to establishment of any program at MCU.

--DOD Civilian Orientation Course. There is a need for a three to five day civilian orientation course sponsored by DOD and conducted

in the Washington area (possibly at NDU). This 'welcome to DOD and the PME arena' type course would provide a framework for the newly recruited educator as to the organization of DOD in general, and the structure and functioning of individual military service PME institutions in particular. It's important for the civilian educator to have insight as to how 'his' service fits into the overall defense picture, as well as how 'his' school approaches PME philosophically.

--Faculty Qualifications. There has historically been a quality 'threshold' in the hiring of civilian professors into the PME arena-the possession of a Doctorate in military history or another related specialty. Unfortunately, this hasn't been the case for the military officer. For Marines, having prior experience or training in education hasn't been a formal requirement for faculty duty, only a 'nice to have'. Additionally, most officers having served as MOIs or in other instructional billets consider another tour as an instructor to be a career detractor, since it will most likely impact on their ability to maintain MOS proficiency and FMF experience. The officer assignment process must ensure a mix of high quality officers are selected to serve as PME faculty. The mix should include some that are operationally oriented, some possessing speciality MOSs, and some who are educators by academic expertise. The topic of faculty qualifications and selection is a subject for an entire paper in and of itself; the point being that the process needs closer scrutiny. A potential point of departure might be to establish a 'military educator' track as is currently done in the acquisition field - where once an officer is specially trained in the program manager/acquisition business, he rotates in and out of FMF

billets in order to keep attuned to the operational worlds' requirements, while using his expertise in the acquisition field when serving outside the FMF. There have been similar proposals within DOD for 'joint officer' tracks while a JSO candidate is attending ILS.

-Joint Speciality Officer Designation. Once a PME institution has been granted accreditation, it's logical that the faculty reviewing, revising, and teaching the curriculum should be JSOs -if not prior to joining the faculty, then certainly at the conclusion of a successful tour. Simply stated, satisfactory completion of a faculty tour at a joint accredited PME school should warrant JSO designation. In addition to being an incentive for military faculty members, It will also help the services keep JSO qualified officers in the pipeline.

-Military Faculty Assignments Within MCU. Consideration should be given to MCU being the 'clearing house' for all inbound MCU personnel. HQMC would assign officers to MCCDC/MCU for further assignment to tenant schools within the command, as is currently the case for personnel assignments in both the Division and Wing. MCU would use 'needs of the school', individual qualifications, and staff evaluation during Phase I of the FDP, as elements of the assignment process. Such a system would enhance putting the 'right' peg in the 'right' hole.

CONCLUSION

Professional Military Education is here to stay, and the Commandant of the Marine Corps -has given it appropriate priority. External sources; the DOD, the House Armed Services Committee, and the CJCS are all 'on board' in the Joint PME arena. The Marine Corps, through the establishment of the Marine Corps University, has made the commitment to PME excellence. The Command and Staff College is broadening its horizons through two additional PME schools under its tutelage- senior level 'Art of War Studies' program, and the second year ILS 'School of Advanced Warfighting'. There are many ingredients necessary for a service PME institution to successfully flourish, but none is more important than its faculty.

Hand in hand with attracting, hiring and nurturing a quality faculty is an effective, progressive, and stimulating Faculty Development Program. The two entities, the faculty and the FDP, are self-perpetuating and interdependent. If MCU, and thus the Marine Corps, is going to continue its positive momentum toward academic excellence, it must take the next step. The FDP outlined in this paper is but a point of departure- food for thought; and perhaps a strawman for the way ahead.

FOOTNOTES

¹ FMFM-1 Warfighting, (U.S. Marine Corps PCN 139 000050 00, March, 1989), p. 49.

² CMC Ltr 1500/CMC, "Training and Education", 1 July 89.

³ House Armed Services Committee Panel on Military Education Report, 21 April 89, p. 74.

⁴ USMC Command and Staff College Course Catalogue, Academic Year 1991-92, p. 21.

⁵ House Armed Services Committee Panel on Military Education Report, 21 April 89, p. 133.

⁶ Interview with Dr. Williamson Murray, Professor of Military History, Ohio State University, 18 April 91.

⁷ House Armed Services Committee Panel on Military Education Report, 21 April 89, p. 142.

⁸ Ibid, p. 133.

⁹ GAO Report, "Marine Corps Status of Recommendations on Officer's Professional Education", February, 1991, p. 23.

¹⁰ Military Education Policy Document (MEPD), 1 May 90, p. B-B-5.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Cheatham, Ernest C., LtGen, USMC (ret). Personal interview, 22 April 91.
2. Commandant of the Marine Corps letter 1500 over CMC dated 1 July 89, to Commanding General, MCCDC, subject: Training and Education.
3. FMFM-1, Warfighting, PCN 139000050 00, 6 March 89.
4. General Accounting Office Report, U.S. Air Force: Status of Recommendations on Officer's Professional Military Education. February 91.
5. General Accounting Office Report, U.S. Army: Status of Recommendations on Officer's Professional Military Education. February, 91
6. General Accounting Office Report, U.S. Marine Corps: Status of Recommendation on Officer's Professional Military Education. February 91.
7. General Accounting Office Report, U.S. Navy; Status of Recommendations on Officer's Professional Military Education.
8. Gholson, Howard, Dr., Educational Specialist, Marine Corps University, Personal Interview, 16 April 91
9. Hearings before the Panel on Military Education of the Committee on Armed Services, House of Representatives; First and Second Sessions, December, 87- September 88. Washington, D.C. 1990
10. Kennedy, William V., "What Future For the Services War Colleges?", Armed Forces Journal, June, 1988.
11. Marine Corps University Campaign Plan, revised draft, 21 May 90.
12. Military Education Policy Document, CM 344-90, Office of The Chairman Joint Chiefs of Staff, Washington, D.C. 1 May 90.

13. Report of the Panel on Military Education of the One Hundredth Congress of the Committee on Armed Services, the House of Representatives. U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington D.C., 21 April 89.
14. Thompson, Brad Lee. "Ready, Aim, Train!" Training Magazine. February, 1991.
15. USMC Command and Staff College Catalogue, Academic Year 1991-92.
16. Wyly, Michael D., Col, USMC; Vice President, Marine Corps University. Personal Interview, 18 April 91.