AU/AWC/190/1998-04

AIR WAR COLLEGE

AIR UNIVERSITY

# INCORPORATING PHASE II – JPME

# INTO

# AIR WAR COLLEGE

by

Violet M. Nicklen, Lt Col, USAF

A Research Report Submitted to the Faculty

In Partial Fulfillment of the Graduation Requirements

Advisor: Dr. James A. Mowbray

Maxwell Air Force Base, Alabama

April 1998

DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A
Approved for Public Release
Distribution Unlimited

20011213 077

## Disclaimer

The views expressed in this academic research paper are those of the author 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*

*Page*

DISCLAIMER ..... ii

PREFACE ..... iv

ABSTRACT ..... v

INTRODUCTION ..... 1

FUTURE SCENARIO FOR SENIOR SERVICE SCHOOLS ..... 4

HISTORY AND EVOLUTION OF JOINT EDUCATION ..... 10
- Joint and Combined Schools ..... 10
- The Creation of the Joint Specialty Officer ..... 11
- Impact of Legislation on Joint Education ..... 12

Goldwater-Nichols Act Implementation Report ..... 13

ADAPTING TO TEACH PHASE II -JPME ..... 18

Organization Changes ..... 21
- Faculty Mix Changes ..... 21
- Student Mix Changes ..... 23

BENEFITS VERSUS OBSTACLES TO CHANGE ..... 26
- Resistance to Change ..... 26
- Cost or Savings? ..... 28
- Accreditation ..... 29

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS ..... 30

APPENDIX A: TABLES ..... 33

GLOSSARY ..... 37

BIBLIOGRAPHY ..... 38

## *Preface*

I developed this research paper to initially take a look at the feasibility of incorporating Phase II of Joint Professional Military Education (JPME) into the Air War College curriculum. In the process of justifying changes to Air War College, the recommended changes ended up impacting all the Senior Service Schools. The root of JPME is the Goldwater-Nichols DOD Reorganization Act of 1986 that legislatively mandated creating the Joint Specialty Officer (JSO). The JSO is specifically trained in, and oriented toward, joint matters. Under the National Defense University umbrella, the Armed Forces Staff College (AFSC), the National War College, and the Industrial College of the Armed Forces are the only sources that can award credit for Phase II of JPME. With only three sources to provide Phase II JPME, the Air Force and the other Services are greatly restricted in whom they can send and when.

I first began pondering this topic while serving on the faculty at AFSC. I have given the arguments why the Services should not teach Phase II much thought, and have approached these objections through a "what if" future scenario. I would like to thank my former colleagues at the AFSC, my research advisor, Dr. James Mowbray, Colonel Joe McCue, Department of Joint Force Employment, and the Joint Staff for their help in gathering information and sources. Much thanks to the Air University Library staff for their support in obtaining the documents that I used for this paper and the tremendous access to joint documentation and contacts on-line through the Internet.

AU/SCHOOL/190/1998-04

## *Abstract*

This research paper examines the feasibility of incorporating Phase II of Joint Professional Military Education (JPME) into the Air War College (AWC) curriculum. The research begins with a future look at how the AWC would be organized if it were teaching JPME Phases I and II. The supportive portion of the paper looks at the history and evolution of joint education within joint and combined schools. The overriding reason for JPME is the creation of the Joint Specialty Officer by the Goldwater-Nichols Reorganization Act of 1986. The management of joint officers has promulgated the necessity for joint education policy requirements and reporting. In exploring these policies and reports, extrapolations and comparisons are made between the joint education policy requirements and the Senior-Level Colleges that provide JPME. How well are National Defense University schools able to support the joint duty assignment requirements now and in the future? The main arguments against the Service colleges teaching Phase II are raised and requirements for adapting are recommended through organization structure, faculty and student mix changes. Finally, the benefits and obstacles concerning resistance, economics, and accreditation are discussed. Recommendations are extrapolated to include other Senior Service Schools and the effect on the Joint and Combined Warfighting School at the Armed Forces Staff College, Norfolk, Virginia.

# Chapter 1

# Introduction

*In no other profession are the penalties for employing untrained personnel so appalling and as irrevocable as in the military.*

—Douglas MacArthur[1]

War is an atrocity and a very expensive proposition for any nation in terms of the loss of national treasures and people. Education and training has been recognized throughout history as a necessity for effective combat readiness. General Douglas MacArthur made this very clear in his annual report as the Chief of Staff, U.S. Army, in 1933. Shortly following World War II, education became an important linkage to preparing senior officers to work better together among our armed forces. As the necessity for joint warfare evolved and Services became more interdependent on one another for victory, the way they thought and fought in a joint fashion made joint education more essential at the highest echelons of command. Are our senior joint education institutions today able to fully meet future joint officer requirements?

The answer is *no*. The Senior Service Schools (SSS) should teach both Phases I and II of Joint Professional Military Education (JPME), because the three senior joint education institutions that teach JPME are inadequate to meet the future joint officer requirements. The three joint education institutions referred to include the National War College, the Industrial College of the Armed Forces, and the Armed Forces Staff College

which all fall under the National Defense University. Their inadequacies to meet joint position requirements are based on three key factors. The first factor is the large numbers of senior officer joint positions that rotate annually. The second factor that relates directly to the billet rotations are the small numbers of graduates from senior military education institutions that teach Phase II or fulfill the qualifications for JPME and nomination as a JSO. The third factor is the reduced senior officer military strengths influenced by both the budgetary downsizing and the naturally increased retirement rates at the twenty-year mark for officer grades 05 - 06.

This research paper is about joint education—more specifically Phase II of Joint Professional Military Education (JPME) and an examination of where it should or could be taught. To provoke thought on this subject, a plausible future scenario of the Senior Service Schools (SSS) is introduced in Chapter 2. In this scenario, the SSSs have incorporated JPME Phase II into their curriculum.

Examination of the history and evolution of joint education in Chapter 3 follows the SSS scenario. A cursory look at the joint Service college charters and why the Joint Specialty Officer was created leads to the impacts the Goldwater-Nichols legislation has had on joint education. The subsequent reporting requirements mandated by this legislation delineate details of the key factors and problems in meeting future joint requirements.

Specific changes need to be incorporated into the SSSs to enable them to effectively teach Phase II JPME. These adaptations will require organizational structure changes as well as faculty and student mix changes to be effective. A look at existing JPME policies

and goals illustrates how changes can be made without tampering with individual Service related school curriculum in Chapter 4.

Chapter 5 addresses the benefits and obstacles to proposed changes. Resistance to change is a natural phenomenon if losses or gains are involved. Losses and gains for organizations are discussed along with the costs or savings expected resulting from the proposed changes. Finally, a summary of conclusions and recommendations complete the study in Chapter 6.

**Notes**

[1] *The Dictionary of War Quotations,* The Free Press, 1989, 113. Douglas MacArthur, 1880-1964. Annual Report of the Chief of Staff, US Army, 1933.

## Chapter 2

# Future Scenario for Senior Service Schools

As a Navy officer, the opportunity to attend a professional military school has arrived late in your career. You have orders to attend the Air War College (AWC). Prior to promotion to Commander, the Navy had kept you busy in successive operational tours. The opportunity for a Service school is granted once in your career either at the intermediate or senior Service school level, but not both. The reason for this restriction was the Navy War College (NWC) programs for intermediate and senior levels were essentially the same.

The Service schools have recently reorganized to incorporate JPME Phase II into their curriculum. Phase I education for the intermediate level is still conducted by Air Command and Staff College, Army Command and General Staff College, College of Naval Command and Staff, Marine Corps Command and Staff College, Service college nonresident courses, or PME courses of study or fellowships granted equivalence by individual Services. Unfortunately, you did not have an opportunity for intermediate level education due to your Service commitments and previous tours of duty. You realize that you are behind the joint education power curve of many of your contemporaries.

Prior to reorganization only the National War College (NWC) and the Industrial College of the Armed Forces (ICAF) fully incorporated both JPME Phases I and II into

their curriculum. The Service schools only taught Phase I, and then officers who were expected to be nominated or selected as Joint Specialty Officers (JSO) were sent to Armed Forces Staff College (AFSC) for an additional 12 weeks temporary duty to receive the Phase II education. The joint education is mandated by the Goldwater-Nichols Department of Defense Reorganization Act of 1986 (Public Law 99-433, 1 October 1986.)

You don't know your follow-on assignment yet from AWC, but you know that you should punch that joint ticket soon if you want to be competitive for flag rank. To qualify for joint assignment consideration, you require joint education. The normal sequencing for becoming a Joint Specialty Officer (JSO) nominee is completion of Phases I and II of JPME and a full joint duty assignment tour. As a nominee, the Services conduct boards to consider individuals for full JSO status.

Under the old system, an officer selected for a joint duty assignment who did not have Phase I through any of the accredited sources could attend a one week Joint Transition Course (JTC) at AFSC to acquire Phase I information, but this did not meet full Phase I qualifications. Usually this course was conducted one week prior to the 12 week Phase II course and included International and U.S. officers who had not attended JPME Phase I courses. A waiver was required from the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff in order to attend Phase II at AFSC before completing Phase I. The waiver was for PJE course sequencing and did not dismiss you from JSO educational requirements for PJE Phase I attendance.[1] This meant you could attend AFSC for Phase II, but had to fulfill Phase I requirements at a later date. Somehow this made sense to the policy people, but it never did to you.

This disadvantage is overcome because, JPME Phases I and II for the senior level is now conducted at the AWC. You would have received credit for these Phases even if you had been selected to attend the Army War College, the College of Naval Warfare, or the Marine Corps War College in residence, because they also have adopted similar changes.

Other ways you could have gotten senior level Phase I credit was by taking Service College nonresident courses, or PME courses of study or fellowships granted equivalence by individual Services. Accomplishing Phase I under nonresident methods would have been more difficult considering the personnel tempo of the jobs that you had been assigned to in the past. The advantage of completing the requirements for both JPME levels in residence is that you are spared an added 12 week temporary duty at AFSC.

AFSC in the past provided a 12 week Phase II program for senior officers (Lt Colonels/Colonels/Navy Captains) who did not receive the joint education as Majors/Lt Commanders. This program was designed to be temporary in nature, but at least three classes a year were taught from its inception. Total graduates only ranged between 90 - 100 a year. Seminars were small averaging 14 – 18 students per class. The incorporation of Phase II into the Senior Service Schools has eliminated the need for this course at AFSC freeing up faculty to teach additional intermediate level seminars.

Arguments against incorporating Phase II into the Service Schools in the past had to do with the lack of Service mix among students and faculty at each Service School. The redesign of respective Service *campus curriculum, faculty mix, student mix, and organization* have eliminated these areas of concern.

The Joint Staff in cooperation with the SSSs have agreed on a common ground of joint instruction essential for all Service colleges.[2] Senior –level college (SLC) learning areas are standardized while learning objectives are tailored to institutional missions. Each Service college is responsible for achieving the standardized JPME Learning Areas (LA) and desired levels of Learning Objectives (LO).

The Services are also executive agents for their respective Service core curriculum within each college organization. For example, AWC is the executive agent responsible for the design and overview of all Air Force core curriculum taught at each respective Service college. The LAs and LOs have been standardized but, the Air Force instructors and professors assigned to teach the Air Force core curriculum at each college are also given the leeway to develop the methodology for teaching. All Air Force personnel assigned as students at each Service College are required to take the core Air Force courses for graduation. Aspects of this curriculum may become electives for study by other Services, but each Service member is responsible for taking core courses in their respective Service Divisions. Thus Air War College, Army War College, College of Naval Warfare, and the Marine Corps War College each have a separate Division of Service related education along with Service related faculty.

To accommodate the argument regarding the faculty and student mix, and to ensure parity among the Services, inter-service agreements have been drawn up. In the agreements, the four senior Service colleges divided up their military instructor billets and detached them to each college to accommodate an appropriate mix of students. The distribution and mix of students is based on normal facility and graduation accommodations for each campus.

To incorporate Phase II - JPME, a joint element was developed which dual hats military members from each respective Service element. These particular billets are included on the Joint Duty Assignment List (JDAL) as joint billets to ensure that instructors have proper joint credentials when teaching the 12 weeks of joint education.

Phase I and II JPME have become a required and commonly agreed upon core course of instruction at each Service College. The executive agent for developing the LAs and LOs for JPME at SSSs is National Defense University (NDU) to ensure uniformity on *joint* related curriculum. Like the Service curriculum, the *joint* designated instructors and professors assigned to teach the *joint* core curriculum at each college are given the leeway to develop the methodology for teaching the LAs and LOs.

The mixes of students are changed for this 12-week period as well as the faculty mix of instructors to allow a good division and mix of Service differences and perspectives. The joint curriculum is taught during the final 12 weeks of the Service College year to ensure just-in-time education prior to reassignment. This final phase of education enhances the cooperation among Services in follow-on assignment to joint or Service components.

As a Navy member, you're happy about these changes because, you won't have to leave your family or job for another 12-week temporary duty at AFSC in Norfolk, Virginia. Plus, your Service avoids additional costs for further temporary duty to AFSC in the immediate or future year. Even if you don't proceed on to a joint tour after AWC, the completion of joint education provides your Service an extra bank of jointly trained officers for future joint assignments.

The above scenario sets the stage for exploring the feasibility of incorporating JPME – Phase II into AWC or SSSs. To appreciate the complexities of this issue, it is necessary to understand the underpinnings and laws governing joint education.

**Notes**

[1] CJCSI 1800.01, *Officer Professional Military Education Policy*, 1 March 1996, B-2.
[2] Ibid.

# Chapter 3

# History and Evolution of Joint Education

*Separate ground, sea, and air warfare is gone forever. If ever again we should be involved in war, we will fight in all elements, with all services, as one single concentrated effort. Peacetime preparation and organizational activity must conform to this fact.*

—President Dwight D. Eisenhower

President Eisenhower recognized the importance of combined and joint operations long before the passage of the Goldwater-Nichols Act. In modern times the reasons for touting the new philosophy of joint education can be attributed to the Goldwater-Nichols Reorganization Act of 1986, but the history and importance of joint operations and education can be traced to an earlier time in American history.

**Joint and Combined Schools**

The establishment of the first joint and combined schools followed World War II. The three joint Service colleges formed were the Army Industrial College, which was renamed the Industrial College of the Armed Force (ICAF) in April 1946, the National War College (NWC) and the Armed Forces Staff College (AFSC) in August 1946. ICAF and NWC are located at Ft McNair, Washington, D.C. and AFSC is located in Norfolk, Virginia. All three colleges were brought under the National Defense University (NDU) by 1981.

The NDU charter is to prepare selected military officers and civilian officials for command, management, and staff responsibilities. The senior colleges emphasize national security formulation, military strategy development, mobilization, management of resources for national security, and planning for joint and combined operations.[1] The Goldwater-Nichols Reorganization Act of 1986 strengthened NDU by establishing requirements for a Joint Specialty Officer (JSO).

**The Creation of the Joint Specialty Officer**

The lessons of Desert One and Vietnam showed Congress that Army, Navy, and Air Force Departments and their members failed to cooperate or work well together, and did not openly accept other Service perspectives nor understand the capabilities or limitations of their sister Services. Assignments on joint and combined staffs were hard to fill and the Services were not sending their best military members. These assignments were not considered career enhancement positions for Service members. This Service-wide attitude resulted in elevating these types of positions and creating a specialty that would enhance promotion potential for individuals who served in these types of assignments. The Goldwater-Nichols Act made joint experience a prerequisite to flag rank.

The Goldwater-Nichols Act created the requirement for a Joint Specialty Officer (JSO). These officers are designated by the Secretary of Defense after completing special education and experience requirements. In addition to their respective Service specialties, JSOs are educated and experienced in the areas of employment, deployment, and support of unified and combined forces to achieve national security objectives. The creation of the JSO has promulgated new policy requirements and reports for joint education.

**Impact of Legislation on Joint Education**

The Goldwater-Nichols Department of Defense Reorganization Act of 1986 required the Secretary of Defense to establish policies, procedures, and practices for the effective management of officers of the military Services who are particularly educated, trained in, and oriented toward, joint matters. The law defined "joint matters" as "the integrated employment of land, sea, and air forces," and this included national military strategy, strategic and contingency planning, and command and control of combat operations under unified command.[2] This law would greatly broaden the responsibilities of NDU and Service Professional Military Education (PME).

Shortly after the law was passed, Congressman Ike Skelton chaired the House Armed Service Committee Panel on PME to undertake the first comprehensive review of PME by Congress in 1987. The purpose of the panel was to evaluate the military's ability to develop strategists and to review joint education requirements. Education was reviewed at all intermediate and senior colleges.

The review resulted in a 206-page report issued in April 1989 that made two key points. The first was to establish a conceptual model to ensure each level of schooling built on previous levels and that each college had a clear and fundamental teaching focus. The second point was to strengthen the two joint schools, NWC and AFSC, and return them to the prominence they formerly enjoyed following World War II. A two-phase approach was recommended where Service schools would focus on greater operational competence in multi-service matters in Phase I. In Phase II, joint education would follow with strategic thinking at the national and senior levels in NWC and, a hands-on approach

to integrate the deployment and employment of joint forces at the intermediate and operational level at AFSC.[3]

In July 1990, AFSC became the single point for completion of intermediate Joint Professional Military Education (JPME) for prospective Joint Specialty Officer (JSO) nominees as mandated by Congress. AFSC per title 10, USC, section 663 (reference b) is the sole joint intermediate institution offering PJE Phase II in its Joint and Combined Staff Officer School (JCSOS) and may not be less than three months.[4] Annual reports are provided to the President and the Congress to show that Services are making progress in implementing the Act.

## Goldwater-Nichols Act Implementation Report

The progress and management of joint officers is annually reflected in the Goldwater-Nichols Act Implementation Report. This report is produced for the Department of Defense using data provided by individual Services to the Joint Duty Assignment Management Information System (JDAMIS). Each Service is required to show the progress and compliance with the Title 10 U.S. Code for the development and implementation of personnel plans to permit the orderly promotion of officers to flag rank. The Services are required to revise career development paths to accommodate early joint assignments; assign greater numbers of 05 and 06 ranking commanders and SSS graduates to joint duty; educate officers on joint education opportunities; and toughen the quality standards for JSO designation.[5]

Joint positions have gradually increased over the years. The report as of September 30, 1996 shows 9340 DOD-wide positions that qualify and have been designated as joint duty assignments. These totals reflect total commissioned officers in the grades of 0-3

through 0-10 less the professional categories of scientific and technical.[6] (See Table 2-1, Appendix A)

The overall average length of tour of duty in joint duty assignments was reported as 37.6 months, just over three years. If roughly a third of these positions become vacant annually, they would require fills from graduates of JPME Phase II education, or fills by personnel selected for a second joint tour. In fact, 2773 field grade officers departed Joint Duty Assignments in FY 1996.[7] Follow-on joint tours are normally preceded by an assignment within an officer's own Military Department to allow them to maintain qualification in their military occupational specialty. Back-to-back joint tours of duty are discouraged for this reason. Officers in follow-on joint tours are probably at the 05 or 06 grade levels if they have remained in Service. Many JPME Phase II graduates opt for the 20-year retirement and this leaves a void of senior officers to fill joint assignments.

Ideally, Phase II should be completed at the 04 grade and intermediate level at AFSC. The main problem with completion of Phase II at the intermediate level is the small opportunity afforded officers because of the small numbers capable of attending and graduating in any given year at AFSC. Personnel who fail to attend Phase II normally will not be considered for JSO nomination. In addition the prerequisites for enrollment in JPME Phase II are restrictive in nature. One must be a commissioned officer in the grade of 0-4 and above, be enroute or assigned to a joint duty assignment, have received credit for Intermediate Service School (ISS) or SSS, and be selected for attendance to AFSC by the individual Services.[8]

According to the JPME Phase II Summary Report, only a total of 861 students graduated from AFSC in FY 1996. (See Table 2-2, Appendix A) Of the 861, only 93

graduated from the three senior classes (JCWS) at AFSC in the academic school year beginning September 1995.[9] The AFSC intermediate classes have a mix of grades 04-05. Those attending the JCWS senior course are in the grades of 05–06 and are selected based on time in grade, experience, and normally have completed senior Service schools. As previously stated, the balance of Phase II graduates required to fill joint assignment openings come from former graduates who would be reassigned into a second joint tour of duty or graduates of the senior-level colleges (SLC) – namely, NWC and ICAF.

What is interesting about the Goldwater-Nichols Act Implementation Report is that the total graduates from NWC and ICAF are not included even though they complete Phase II JPME equivalency. Statistics provided by NWC and ICAF revealed 303 military graduates in FY 1996 (See Table 2-3, Appendix A).[10] All officers with the joint specialty who graduate from each JPME must be assigned to a JDA as their next duty assignment unless waived by the Secretary of Defense. At least 50 per cent of all other officers graduating from each JPME school must fill a JDA as their next duty assignment.[11] In spite of 1164 graduates from AFSC, NWC, and ICAF in FY1996, there were still shortages in filling critical joint positions.

In FY 1996, there were 88 of 1000 joint duty critical positions that were filled by officers who did not possess the joint specialty. Joint duty critical positions are graded out as 05 and above, because they require fully qualified JSOs to fill them. Two major reasons for filling joint critical positions with officers who were not JSO were: (1) the JSO was not yet available and, (2) the best qualified officer was not a joint specialist.[12]

To date, SSSs provide an initial PJE stage (Phase I) of senior-level JPME. Graduates who will be assigned to a joint assignment following graduation must attend

AFSC. The AFSC Joint and Combined Warfighting School (JCWS) was originally established on a temporary and transitional basis for teaching JPME senior-level Phase II. It was designed to exist for a limited period of time until the Services caught up with growing JSOs through the intermediate levels. The problem is that there are still JSO shortages and senior officers are still being pushed through AFSC.

SSSs like AWC can open the bottleneck to joint education for senior officers. AWC can prepare senior officers for follow-on joint assignments by assuming the responsibility for the Phase II senior-level of joint education. Understanding the policies, goals, and objectives required and adapting the organization, faculty and student mixes, and curriculum to meet these policies, goals, and objectives would be necessary to assume this responsibility.

**Notes**

[1] AFSC Pub 1, *The Joint Staff Officer's Guide 1997*, 1-25. For further reference on JPME, see Joint Admin Pub 1.2 (*Joint Officer Management*) Appendix VI, and JCS Memo SM-73-89, *Implementation of the JCS Program for Joint Professional Military Education* (JPME).

[2] The Joint Staff Officer's Guide 1997, AFSC Pub 1, 1-23. See Goldwater-Nichols DOD Reorganization Act of 1986, Title IV, Joint Officer Management.

[3] Ike Skelton, "Taking Stock of the New Joint Era", *Joint Force Quarterly*, Number 3-16-17,Winter 1993-94, 15-21. Also, see U.S. Congress, House of Representatives, Committee on Armed Service, Report of the Panel on Military Education, 101st Congress, 1st Session, 21 April 1989.

[4] CJCSI 1800.01,*Officer Professional Military Education Policy*, 1 Mar 1996,A-B-4.

[5] William S. Cohen, Secretary of Defense, *Annual Report to the President and the Congress*, April 1997, Appendix E. Also, see the National Defense Authorization Act, FY 1994, Section 931.

[6] Joint Admin Pub 1.2, *Joint Officer Management*, 30 Jun 1989 has the detail on what types of positions do not require joint duty for promotion to the general rank, VII-2. This Pub is being updated and replaced by DODD 1300.XX, *Joint Officer Management Program*. This DOD directive is still in draft and was not available to writer.

[7] Goldwater-Nichols Act Implementation Report, Table E-10.

[8] Armed Forces Staff College, Internet, September 1997, available from http://www.afsc.edu/preq2.htm.

[9] Data provided by Gail Smith, Educational Assessment Division, AFSC, Feb 1998.

## Notes

[10] Lt Col Shane Ostrom, USAF provided data from the Joint Officer Management Office (JOMO), Manpower and Personnel (J-1) of the Joint Staff. Student composition reports are provided by NDU schools to the Joint Staff (J-1 and J-7) indicating the number of students by Service and other personnel detail per CJCSI 1800.01, *Officer Professional Military Education Policy*, 1 Mar 96, Appendix A, Enclosure B, B-A-7.

[11] JCS Admin Pub 1.2, *Joint Officer Management*, 30 Jun 1989, VI-2.

[12] Goldwater-Nichols Act Implementation Report, E-5.

# Chapter 4

# Adapting to Teach Phase II -JPME

***Subject to the direction, authority, and control of the President and the Secretary of Defense, the Chairman will: Formulate policies for coordinating the military education and training of the Armed Forces.***

*Joint Pub 0-2, UNAAF*[1]

Unified Action Armed Forces (UNAAF) clearly spells out the responsibilities of the Chairman for joint education as delineated in the DOD Reorganization Act of 1986. The Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff created a Director of Military Education in 1989 in response to recommendations in the House Armed Service Committee Panel Report on PME. The newly established Military Education Division (J-7) prepared policies to develop and execute a JSO education program and issued a memorandum in May 1990. The former policy memorandum's second revision is the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff Instruction, 1800.01, *Officer Professional Military Education Policy*, issued 1 March 1996. It provides the guidance for joint education policy requirements in the form of goals and objectives and specifies what colleges are accredited to teach JPME.

To adapt Service Senior-Level Colleges (SLC) to teach Phase II, a look at goals and objectives for senior-level Professional Joint Education (PJE) is necessary. The Service's SLCs include the Air War College, the Army War College, the College of Naval Warfare, and the Marine Corps War College. The Service SLCs currently teach senior-

level PJE – Phase I. The follow-on Phase I curriculum SLCs must be taught at a higher level of learning than Intermediate-Level Colleges (ILCs).

The NDU colleges are comprised of ICAF, NWC, and AFSC (JCSOS/JCWS). According to policy, the terms PJE Phases I and II do not apply to NWC or ICAF as these each have unique educational focuses and missions. However, the NWC and ICAF teach senior level PJE, and the curriculum produces JSO-qualified graduates (Equivalents of Phases I and II). AFSC only teaches Phase II, both intermediate and senior levels.

The joint emphasis for PJE - Phase I is standard for all SLCs. The latest revision to the Officer Professional Military Education Policy standardized the learning areas (LA) for SLCs. These LAs are also the same for NWC, and ICAF, while AFSC has retained it own unique goals and learning objectives. The goals and LOs for AFSC PJE Phase II are uniform for both intermediate and senior levels, but differ from the LOs for SLCs, ICAF, and NWC. (See Tables 3-1 and 3-2, Appendix A for AFSC goal and LO detail).[2] This finding is curious, because Phase II for senior level officers should be taught at a higher level then the intermediate levels, but they don't at AFSC. If the goals and LOs are the same, why are there separations between senior and intermediate levels at AFSC? The answer is simply in status, grades, and experience levels.

Although LAs were standardized for all colleges except AFSC, the learning objectives (LO) were tailored to respective institution missions. For example, the Service SLCs all have identical LOs while NWC and ICAF LOs differ based on their particular missions. The LAs required at all Service SLCs, NWC, and ICAF include; National Security Strategy, national planning systems and processes, National Military Strategy

and organization, theater strategy and campaigning, and systems integration in the 21st century.

Bloom's Taxonomy of Educational Objectives is used as a policy standard to indicate a level of learning achievement for each LO. (See Table 3-3, Appendix A for detail and comparison between senior level PJE LO learning levels) Each level of JPME establishes LOs and uses a descriptive verb drawn from Bloom's Taxonomy to identify standards for measuring the level of learning achievement. Bloom's Taxonomy does not prescribe the educational technique or methodology to be used in accomplishing each objective, but lists and defines a hierarchy of six levels of learning that are: know, comprehend, apply, analyze, synthesize, and evaluate.[3]

The ILCs teach PJE – Phase I at the lowest learning levels of knowledge and comprehension. The follow-on PJE – Phase I at the SLCs is required and does teach at the higher levels of comprehensive learning and above. Likewise, the NWC and ICAF both satisfy the educational requirements for JSO qualification at the higher levels of learning. The nine LOs for AFSC also indicate a higher level of learning at the application and above level for both intermediate and senior officers for Phase II JPME education.

Rarely do students attend AFSC without completing Phase I by correspondence, seminar, or an equivalent program. AFSC conducts a brief refresher course for officers entering PJE Phase II on direct entry waivers. Waivers are rare and often are the result where an officer career path did not allow attendance at a resident PME program. Sometimes attendees are scheduled to attend a resident PME out of normal sequence immediately following Phase II. PJE - Phase I may or may not have been accomplished

by a Service member because, the importance placed on PME may differ from one Service to another. For example, the Navy does not emphasize PME as much toward promotion potential as the Air Force.

In summary, the LAs for SLCs are the same as the NWC and ICAF. The LOs are also identical for the SLCs but differ from NWC and ICAF because of their unique missions. A comparison of LOs shows that learning levels are equivalent between the SLCs and NDU colleges. If the LAs and learning levels are the same, what changes would be required for a SLC such as AWC to be able to adapt to teaching Phase II without losing its unique Service perspective mission? An organizational change of some kind would certainly be necessary. The extent of this change should be examined.

## Organization Changes

Organization changes envisioned for Senior Level Colleges would be based on restructuring more along the lines of a state or private college that provides separate functional departments. In the case of the Service colleges, each college would include individual Departments for Air Force, Navy, Army, and Joint. Each department would be further subdivided to include education curriculum that independent Service colleges currently teach such as strategy, doctrine, air, sea, land power, etc.

### Faculty Mix Changes

The biggest difference between the Service SLCs and the NDU colleges can be found in the Service mix of faculty and students. Naturally the Service colleges are made up of primarily military instructors and students from the same Service. According to policy, the percentage requirements for quality of faculty at Service and NDU SLCs

are identical. Military education policy states that seventy-five per cent of the military faculty should be graduates of a senior-level program or JSOs. Faculty must be of the highest caliber, combining functional or operational expertise with teaching ability and possess strong academic credentials. Faculty qualifications are measured by each Service and education institution. The selection is based on individual Service member records.[4]

If Service SLCs are to teach JPME Phases I and II, the only thing that requires change is in the mix of military faculty members whose primary duty is student instruction. The faculty mix that actively teaches should be increased from 10 to 33% per cent from each nonhost Military Department. The combined nonhost Military Department faculty total is required to be no less than 25 per cent already.[5]

Many military members are hesitant to apply for teaching positions, because they do not believe them to be positions with promotion potential. Better marketing of teaching jobs and incentives would encourage more volunteers. If SLCs teach JPME Phases I and II, the positions responsible for teaching this joint curriculum should be included on the Joint Duty Assignment List (JDAL) like teaching positions at the NDU. There are no limitations on the number of positions that can be placed on the JDAL. Joint positions have a higher priority for fill and are more desirable than ordinary teaching positions. Because personnel are carefully screened for selection to these positions (much like Service Headquarters' positions), their records and achievements naturally place them at a higher advantage for promotion potential. This increase in promotion potential would encourage a wider selection of volunteers for teaching assignments.

JSOs are supposed to be qualified in both Service and Joint perspectives, so why can't they teach both? Some faculty positions would have dual-hat responsibilities for

teaching not only the joint curriculum but their respective Service core curriculum as well. This would insure that the Services retain their unique perspective and mission. Each SLC would be organized with Air Force, Army and Navy Divisions represented from each Service Department; thus the crossflow of information would be enhanced.

**Student Mix Changes**

The biggest change to the SLCs is the mix of students who attend. The quotas would need to be changed to reflect a third from each Military Department or a ratio acceptable to the Services and the Joint Staff. The Marines and Coast Guard students would be included with the Navy Department for accounting purposes, but all four Services would have separate core seminars during the period that core Service curricula are taught.

Three quarters of the year would be dedicated to the Service college curriculum to ensure that Service perspectives and educational missions are met. The final quarter would teach phases I and II of joint education. Proposed changes are not met to eliminate Service cultures or to make the SLCs "purple" in nature. The Military Education Division, J-7, Joint Staff would still be responsible for soliciting team members nominations from OSD, the Services, and NDU to develop and oversee the design of joint curriculum goals and objectives dispensed to the joint departments at each SLC. Likewise, the Services would retain responsibility for overseeing the design of Service curriculum goals and objectives dispensed to the respective Service department at each SLC.

The student mixes would reflect the same mix we see today in our Service schools. Seminar mixes should include at least one officer from each of the two nonhost Military

Departments accounting for a minimum of 20 percent of the total military student body. Therefore the Navy Commander discussed in the future scenario could be assigned as a student to either the Air Force Department or the Navy Department, depending on Service requirements. Navy officers who are air officers may be the choices for Air Force Department mixes to learn more about the Air Force perspective on the air arm of combat.

The final quarter of the year would be dedicated to teaching a minimum of 12 weeks to finalize senior-level JPME requirements (Phases I and II combined). Students will gain joint perspectives and a distinct understanding of joint matters at national levels. This last quarter also requires the students to reorganize into new mixes. These mixes would require a minimum of 30-33% per cent student representation from each nonhost Military Department or a ratio satisfactory to Services and Joint Staff requirements. This change in student mix is necessary to ensure all Service perspectives are fairly represented. The distribution and mix of students is based on normal facility and graduation accommodations for each campus. The computations pertain only to military personnel for student and faculty mixes.

The next chapter addresses some questions and potential obstacles to overcome. Do the benefits outweigh the obstacles? What kind of resistance can be expected from the Services, the CINCs, and the Joint Staff? Is this reconfiguration cost efficient? Who is responsible for the accreditation of JPME programs?

**Notes**

[1] Joint Pub 0-2, *Unified Action Armed Forces* (UNAAF), Chapter II, Functions of the Department of Defense and its major components, 7. Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, II-8.

## Notes

[2] CJCSI 1800.01, *Officer Professional Military Education Policy*, 1 Mar 1996, B-A-1.

[3] Ibid., Enclosure C, Appendix C-E. A description of verbs from Bloom's Taxonomy of Education Objectives (reference k) is included in Appendix C.

[4] Ibid., Appendix B, Enclosure D. This is further described under standard 5 and 6 for the Process for Accreditation of Joint education (PAJE)

[5] Ibid., Enclosure B, B-2, B-3.

# Chapter 5

# Benefits Versus Obstacles to Change

*Progress is a nice word. But change is its motivator and change has its enemies.*

*Robert F. Kennedy* [1]

Progress in developing joint education does not need to be painful. In fact goals remain the same as outlined in Chapter 4. Any benefits or obstacles will certainly need to be weighed in making a final decision regarding changes to SLCs and AFSC. The alternative future scenario presented in Chapter 2 gives food for thought as to how Services could better synchronize their education without losing their Service flavor or relinquishing educational responsibilities. Integration of PJE – Phase II becomes possible when SLCs combine resources in an efficient and effective manner.

## Resistance to Change

Resistance to change can be expected, but should be minimal, because key players retain the same responsibilities. There is a certain amount of common ground covered among the SLCs in topic areas. The joint areas are also common, based on the Learning Areas and Learning Objectives previously discussed. This leaves the differences in the unique Service areas. Although Services are co-located on a single college campus under the proposed scenario, Service uniqueness is preserved because those same Service

members assigned teach the Service core curriculum. Each Service retains the responsibility for developing the LAs and LOs unique to their Department. The degree granting responsibilities remain with each respective school. Army or Navy core subjects taught at Air War College for example are enhanced, because sister Service personnel and experts are readily available to discuss issues and topics of equal importance.

The education requirements that military officers will need in the future to lead and staff U.S. forces successfully will be different. The primary foundations for each Service are still essential. A comprehension of Service capabilities, limitations, and the appropriate application of military forces to future operations are necessary in the education of senior officers. Equally important for future operations is an understanding of these same aspects of each sister Service.

The Joint Staff and NDU may resist relinquishing the senior PJE – Phase II course at AFSC. The SLCs provide PJE – Phase I education now with follow-on PJE – Phase II at the AFSC JCWS. Serious consideration should be given to eliminating this course at AFSC, because SLCs can successfully provide PJE – Phase II by changing the organizational structure of each SLC. The recommended change leaves each Service core curriculum intact, but joint training is enhanced because of the ability to mix faculty and students from other Service Departments. Incorporating these changes would mean that the follow-on temporary duty for twelve weeks at AFSC becomes unnecessary and, students can proceed directly to joint assignments from each SLC. Also, the JCWS at AFSC often has trouble getting enough senior personnel from the Services to fill the senior seminar quotas. AFSC reaches down into the intermediate level courses, the Joint and Combined Staff Officer School (JCSOS), to make up the shortfall in students needed.

The Commanders in Chiefs of Unified Commands (CINCs) should be satisfied that their officers' assignments are no longer interrupted prior to, or during, their tours of duty due to mandated educational requirements for PJE – Phase II. PJE – Phase II education should be done prior to assignment, particularly if the purpose is to prepare selected senior officers for joint and combined staff duty. In some cases, students have completed Phase II following completion of JDAs instead of prior to assignment. Reasons for this vary, but often it was due to the limited availability of Service openings at AFSC following completion of SLC. Consequently, the Services send these students out of preferred sequence to AFSC within a year or later on station, or following completion of assignment. This late education is required to meet the qualifications for JSO nomination, but the value of the education becomes substantially diminished at this point and disruptive to the unified command. The officer has usually acquired what they need to know for their position through hands on training by this time. The effect of the school becomes arbitrary, capricious and a waste of money.

**Cost or Savings?**

There should be no major cost difference in realigning billets between the SLCs, but there would be a savings realized by eliminating the temporary duty requirement for PJE – Phase II at AFSC. The exchange of military billets between Service colleges would occur as military instructors rotate. Service manpower books are realigned through Memorandums of Agreement and dual-hat billets are added to the JDAL. Student-faculty ratios required for SLCs are 3.5:1 and, ILCs and AFSC are 4:1[2]. Currently AFSC requires two to three military instructors from different Service Department backgrounds for each Seminar. These instructors may be military or civilian. The civilian instructors

are often prior military officers with joint operational experience, and the military faculty are normally JSOs or officers who have completed a joint tour of duty. SLCs could easily adopt the AFSC faculty and student mix formula by dual-hatting military instructors.

**Accreditation**

Accreditation of the JPME remains the function of the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. The Military Education Division, J-7, implements it, Joint Staff, as outlined in CJCSI 1800.01, Officer Professional Military Education Policy. Although different than civilian universities, JPME accreditation is similar in that it is a peer review process and accomplished by individuals who are familiar with the subject matter and environment at the SLCs. The review team is comprised of Service, Joint Staff, and NDU representatives. The purpose of review is to strengthen and sustain professional education.[3]

**Notes**

[1] *The New York Public Library Book of Twentieth-Century American Quotations*, Warner Books, New York, 1992, 101. "Federal Power and Local Poverty", The Pursuit of Justice, 1964.

[2] CJCSI 1800.01, *Officer Professional Military Education Policy*, 1 Mar 1996, Enclosure B, B-3.

[3] Ibid., Enclosure D.

# Chapter 6

# Conclusions and Recommendations

*Education is what survives when what has been learned has been forgotten.*

*B.F. Skinner*[1]

The future scenario of Air War College incorporating JPME – Phase II was developed to introduce another way to meet the intent of the Goldwater-Nichols legislation for joint education without jeopardizing the integrity of the Service core curriculum taught at each SLC. Joint education is here to stay and its importance is increasing as Services continue to downsize and become interdependent on one another to meet the capabilities required for new and expanding mission roles. Decision-makers can take action to increase the number of senior officers who are jointly educated, or maintain the status quo and continue to have a shortage of qualified JSO officers to fill Joint Critical positions due to limited AFSC, NWC, and ICAF facility capabilities and unplanned retirements.

The new joint education policy requirements apply equally to NDU and Service SLCs. The LAs are identical for SLCs, and LOs and learning level expectations are identical among Service colleges. The bottleneck created by AFSC JCWS can be easily remedied by simple realignment of manpower between Service colleges to permit the proper mix of faculty for incorporating PJE – Phase II into Service college curriculum.

Likewise, a more equal representation of students will complete the organization adaptation. The following actions are recommended to incorporate JPME Phase II into the SLCs:

1. Top-down agreement and support from the Services and the Joint Chiefs to incorporate Phase II into Service SLCs.

2. Educational conference(s) between Service SLCs and Joint educators needed to formulate a plan to assess:

a. The layout of current Service and Joint curriculum in relation to hours taught in each of the common learning areas and requirements unique to each SLC.

b. The adequacy of time (10 months to one year), manpower, and sufficient budgets to meet the Service and Joint SLC education requirements.

c. Service facilities and capacity for students and faculty at each SLC.

d. The appropriate faculty and student mixes required for Service and Joint educational requirements.

e. Service host organization and command structure requirements and support requirements.

3. Set milestones and dates for implementation.

4. Task Service manpower and quality personnel to lead a Tiger Team made up of Service and Joint representatives to implement the effort to incorporate Phase II into Service SLCs.

5. Develop Memorandum of Agreements between Services regarding smooth exchange of required billets and personnel.

6. Develop review goals and indicators to analyze results of implementation.

In the future scenario presented in Chapter 2, the Services, the CINCs, AFSC, and the individual all benefited from the changes made at AWC and other Service colleges. First, the Services increased their pool of quality officers who are jointly educated for future assignments. Secondly, officers who go on to joint assignments will not be curtailed into additional twelve-week temporary duty assignments away from their family or work. Third, the CINCs will not lose key personnel during their tours of duty to attend follow-on joint education, because the SLCs met the requirements for PJE – Phases I and II. Finally, AFSC will be able to realign instructors and monies to educate more intermediate-level officers, and transfer budget savings from student field trips to higher school priorities. [2]

Serious consideration for incorporating PJE - Phase II into SLCs is recommended to facilitate growth or down-sizing in our Service colleges and to explore new and improved methods for achieving joint education requirements in the future.

**Notes**

[1] *Dictionary of Quotations,* Macmillan Publishing Company, New York, 1987,179. New Scientist, 21 May 1964, 'Education in 1984'

[2] JCWS Senior classes take two field trips. One week to the Washington DC area and one week to visit varied CINC's Headquarters. Intermediate classes do not take trips.

# Appendix A

# Tables

**Table 2.1. Joint Duty Position Distribution by Service (As of September 30, 1996)**

| As of Sep 30, 1996 | Joint Staff | Other Joint Duty | Total Joint Duty | Total DOD JDAs% | Total DOD Officers% |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| USA | 269 | 2980 | 3249 | 34.8% | 28.7% |
| USAF | 270 | 3247 | 3517 | 37.7% | 38.1% |
| USMC | 65 | 494 | 559 | 6.0% | 8.4% |
| USN | 213 | 1802 | 2015 | 21.6% | 24.8% |
| DOD | 817 | 8523 | 9340 | 100.0% | 100.0% |

Source: William S. Cohen, Secretary of Defense, *Annual Report to the President and the Congress, Goldwater-Nichols Act Implementation Report,* Appendix E, April 1997, Table E-8, E-4.

**Table 2-2. Joint Professional Military Education (JPME) Phase II Summary Graduates of AFSC (FY1996)**

| | USA | USAF | USMC | USN | TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Students graduating from Armed Forces Staff College in FY 1996 | 282 | 321 | 46 | 212 | 861 |
| Students who had not completed resident PME (percent of total) | 43(15%) | 68(21%) | 0(0%) | 73(35%) | 184(21%) |
| Students who had completed nonresident PME (percent of total) | 40(14%) | 68(21%) | 0(0%) | 72(34%) | 180(21%) |
| Students who had not completed resident or nonresident PME (percent of total) | 3(1%) | 0(0%) | 0(0%) | 1(0%) | 4(0%) |

**Source:** William S. Cohen, Secretary of Defense, *Annual Report to the President and the Congress, Goldwater-Nichols Act Implementation Report,* Appendix E, April 1997, Table E-11, E-6.

**Table 2-3. JPME Phase II Equivalency Summary Graduates from NWC and ICAF (FY 1996)**

| | USA | USAF | USMC | USN | TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Students graduating from National War College in FY 1996 | 44 | 42 | 13 | 29 | 128 |
| Students graduating from Industrial College of the Armed Forces in FY 1996 | 61 | 59 | 11 | 44 | 175 |
| Totals | 105 | 101 | 24 | 73 | 303 |

**Source:** Joint Officer Management Office (JOMO), Manpower and Personnel, J-1 of the Joint Staff.

**Table 3-1. AFSC Goals - Intermediate and Senior Level PJE Phase II**

| |
|---|
| Nurture joint and multinational military perspectives, teamwork, and problem solving. |
| Analyze historical and current operations and/or campaigns to enhance students' capability for future planning. |
| Assist in preparing officers for joint command or to advise joint commanders. |
| Develop competencies in joint warfighting by using joint and multinational forces in joint and multinational operations. |
| Instill primary commitment to joint requirements over individual service needs. |

**Source:** CJCS 1800.01, Officer Professional Military Education Policy, 1 Mar 1996, B-A-1

**Table 3-2. AFSC Learning Objectives –Intermediate and Senior Level PJE Phase II**

| |
|---|
| *Analyze* the complexities of assessing and synthesizing theater strategy and coordinating joint, interagency, and multinational resources during strategy execution. |
| *Apply* joint principles and lessons learned from past operations and campaigns in employing unified and joint forces throughout the range of military operations. |
| *Design and apply* appropriate organizational and command relationships for unified commands, and joint and multinational task forces. |
| *Analyze* the complexities of integrating battlespace systems supporting joint and multinational forces. |
| *Understand and apply* the processes and principles of joint planning systems that affect unified, joint, and multinational operations. |
| *Apply* appropriate problem solving techniques using current joint planning technology to accomplish concept, force, and support planning; transportation assessment; and wargaming. |
| *Demonstrate* an ability to create and brief campaign plans, joint operations plans, and operation orders. |
| *Analyze* the role that effective C4I plays in joint operation planning. |
| *Demonstrate* a thoroughly joint perspective and comprehension of the increased power available to commanders through joint efforts and teamwork. |

**Source:** CJCS 1800.01, Officer Professional Military Education Policy, 1 Mar 1996, Enclosure C, Appendix F.

**Table 3-3. Comparison of Levels of Learning among Senior JPME**

| Learning Areas | Senior SLC | NWC | ICAF |
|---|---|---|---|
| National Security Strategy | 5 LOs:<br>2 Comprehend<br>3 Apply | 4 LOs:<br>1 Comprehend<br>1 Analyze<br>2 Evaluate | 12 LOs:<br>3 Comprehend<br>3 Apply<br>3 Analyze<br>1 Synthesize<br>2 Evaluate |
| National Planning Systems and Processes | 4 LOs:<br>2 Comprehend<br>1 Apply<br>1 Analyze | 4 LOs:<br>1 Apply<br>3 Analyze | 4 LOs:<br>4 Apply |
| National Military Strategy and Organization | 7 LOs:<br>5 Comprehend<br>2 Apply | 4 LOs:<br>3 Comprehend<br>1 Analyze | 4 LOs:<br>2 Apply<br>1 Analyze<br>1 Synthesize |
| Theater Strategy and Campaigning | 4 LOs:<br>2 Comprehend<br>2 Evaluate | 3 LOs:<br>1 Apply<br>1 Analyze<br>1 Evaluate | 2 LOs:<br>1 Apply<br>1 Synthesize |
| Systems Integration in 21st Century | 4 LOs:<br>2 Comprehend<br>2 Evaluate | 3 LOs:<br>1 Comprehend<br>1 Analyze<br>1 Evaluate | 4 LOs:<br>1 Know<br>1 Analyze<br>2 Evaluate |

**Legend:** LO = Learning Objectives

**Source:** CJCS 1800.01, Officer Professional Military Education Policy, 1 Mar 1996, Enclosure C, Appendix C-E. LOs are categorized using the description of verbs from Bloom's Taxonomy of Education Objectives (reference k) as included in Appendix C.

## *Glossary*

| | |
|---|---|
| AFSC | Armed Forces Staff College |
| AWC | Air War College |
| CINC | Commander in Chief |
| ICAF | Industrial College of the Armed Forces |
| ILC | Intermediate Level Colleges |
| ISS | Intermediate Service Schools |
| JCSOS | Joint and Combined Staff Officer School |
| JCWS | Joint and Combined Warfighting School |
| JDA | Joint Duty Assignment |
| JDAL | Joint Duty Assignment List |
| JDAMIS | Joint Duty Assignment Management Information System |
| JPME | Joint Professional Military Education |
| JSO | Joint Specialty Officer |
| JTC | Joint Transition Course |
| LA | Learning Area |
| LO | Learning Objective |
| NDU | National Defense University |
| NMS | National Military Strategy |
| NSS | National Security Strategy |
| NWC | National War College |
| PAJE | Process for Accreditation of Joint Education |
| PJE | Professional Joint Education |
| PME | Professional Military Education |
| SLC | Senior Level College |
| SSS | Senior Service School |

## *Bibliography*


Armed Forces Staff College, AFSC Pub 1, *The Joint Staff Officer's Guide 1997*, 1-25.

Armed Forces Staff College, Internet, September 1997, available from http://www.afsc.edu/preq2.htm.

Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff Instruction. CJCSI 1800.01, *Officer Professional Military Education Policy*, 1 March 1996.

Cohen, William S., Secretary of Defense, *Annual Report to the President and the Congress*, April 1997, Goldwater-Nichols Act Implementation Report, Appendix E, Table E-10.

*Dictionary of Quotations,* Macmillan Publishing Company, New York, 1987,179.

*The Dictionary of War Quotations,* The Free Press, 1989, 113.

Department of Defense, DODD 1300.XX, *Joint Officer Management Program*, (draft).

Goldwater-Nichols DOD Reorganization Act of 1986, Title IV, Joint Officer Management.

Joint Chiefs of Staff, Joint Admin Pub 1.2 (*Joint Officer Management*) Appendix VI, VII-2.

Joint Chiefs of Staff, Joint Pub 0-2, *Unified Action Armed Forces* (UNAAF), II-8.

Joint Chiefs of Staff, JCS Memo SM-73-89, *Implementation of the JCS Program forJoint Professional Military Education* (JPME).

Joint Officer Management Office (JOMO), Manpower and Personnel (J-1)

The National Defense Authorization Act, FY 1994, Section 931.

*The New York Public Library Book of Twentieth-Century American Quotations*, Warner Books, New York, 1992, 101.

Skelton, Ike. "Taking Stock of the New Joint Era", *Joint Force Quarterly*, Number 3-16-17,Winter 1993-94, 15-21.

U.S. Congress, House of Representatives, Committee on Armed Service, *Report of the Panel on Military Education,* 101st Congress, 1st Session, 21 April 1989.

DISTRIBUTION A:

Approved for public release; distribution is unlimited.

Air War College
Maxwell AFB, Al 36112