


The Air University (AU)
Board of Visitors (BOV)
Meeting Minutes

14 – 15 November 2011 / 0800 – 1700
Open Meeting
Commander's Conference Room (B800)
Maxwell Air Force Base, AL 35112

This report and the recommendations contained herein are based upon the Board of Visitors' independent assessment of the facts presented by the Department of the Air Force and The Air University. The Board of Visitors' recommendations are based upon the consensus opinion of the members, and were done without any influence from interested parties. Board of Visitors members, if they disagree with the majority position, are encouraged to submit Minority Statements and, when submitted, they are attached to the final Board of Visitors' report for consideration by the Department of the Air Force.


NORM R. AUGUSTINE
Chair, AU Board of Visitors
February 21st, 2012

Section I: Board Attendance
Section II: Board Activities and Discussions
Section III: Board Actions
Section IV: Board Requests, Observations, and Recommendations
Section V: Status on Previous Meeting Requests, Observations, and Recommendations
Section VI: SECAF Outbrief Executive Summary, June 2011
Section VII: SECAF Outbrief Executive Summary, January 2012
Section VIII: Subcommittee(s) Meeting Summary

Section I: Board Attendance

A. Board Members attending the meeting:

1. Dr. Terry Alfriend
2. Mr. Norman Augustine
3. Col Robert Beasley, USAF, Ret
4. Rev William Beauchamp
5. Mrs. Mary Boies
6. Gen Charles Boyd, USAF, Ret
7. Maj Gen Stephen Condon, USAF, Ret
8. Ambassador Gary Cooper, Maj Gen, USMC, Ret
9. Dr. Don Daniel
10. Dr. Stephen Fritz
11. Mr. Henry Fong
12. Gen Patrick Gamble, USAF, Ret
13. Dr. Rufus Glasper
14. Dr. Tito Guerrero
15. Dr. Jack Hawkins
16. Dr. Muriel Howard
17. Dr. Benjamin Lambeth
18. CMSgt Karl Meyers, USAF, Ret
19. Dr. Ann Millner
20. CMSAF Gerald Murray, USAF, Ret
21. Vice Adm Daniel Oliver, USN, Ret
22. Maj Gen Richard Paul, USAF, Ret
23. Brig Gen Clifton Poole, USA, Ret
24. Maj Gen Ron Sega, USAF, Ret
25. Dr. Eugene Spafford
26. Mr. Fletcher Wiley

B. Members of the AU BOV absent:

1. Dr. Susan Aldridge
2. Adm Vern Clark, USN, Ret
3. Dr. Ding-Jo Currie
4. Dr. Mildred Garcia
5. Dr. Joe Lee

C. Air University and other personnel attending the meeting:

1. Lt Gen David Fadok, AU/CC
2. Maj Gen Thomas Andersen, AU/CV
3. Maj Gen Thomas Coon, AU/CR
4. Maj Gen Scott Hanson, Spaatz Center/CC
5. Dr. Bruce Murphy, AU/CF
6. Dr. John Shaud, AFRI/CL
7. Brig Gen Stephen Denker, ACSC/CC
8. Brig Gen Roger Watkins, Holm Center/CC
9. Col David Cohen, AU/DS
10. Col Timothy Lawrence, AFIT/CC
11. Col Timothy Schultz, SAASS/CC
12. Col John McCain, Eaker Center/CC
13. Col Susan Schlacter, 42 ABW/CV
14. CMSgt Lonnie Slater, AU/CCC
15. Dr. Hank Dasinger, AU/CFA
16. Dr. Glen Spivey, ACSC
17. Mrs. Diana Bunch, Designated Federal Officer
18. Ms. Jaye Panza, NPS
19. Dr. James Fisher, Contractor

Section II: Board Activities and Discussions

A. The Air University (AU) Board of Visitors (BOV) meeting convened at 0800 hours on 14 November 2011 in the AU Headquarters' Conference Room at Maxwell Air Force Base, AL. Dr. Jack Hawkins chaired the meeting and welcomed the Board members. Dr. Hawkins informed the Board members that this formal meeting was open to the public and was advertised in the Federal Register on 11 October 2011 (Vol.76, No. 196). Mrs. Diana Bunch, Designated Federal Officer for the Board, was present during the meeting and a quorum was met.

B. After an overview of the meeting agenda and activities, Dr. Hawkins informed the Board that the previous meeting minutes were approved on 19 May 2011 and that the Board had received Air University's responses to the recommendations contained in those minutes. In addition, Dr. Hawkins thanked Lt Gen David Fadok for the Board's invitation to participate in the Honorary Degree ceremony honoring Mr. Thomas Brokaw.

C. Dr. Hawkins provided an overview of the following Board's activities since the previous April Board meeting:

(1) Strategic Planning Group met numerous times over the summer and is scheduled to outbrief the Secretary of the Air Force on 20 January 2012. Members include: Gen (ret) Pat Gamble (Ad Hoc Chair), Mr. Norm Augustine, Mrs. Mary Boies, ADM (ret) Vern Clark, Maj Gen (ret) Pat Condon, Dr. Muriel Howard and Dr. Ann Millner. Recommendations from this group are listed in Section IV of these minutes.

(2) Members of the Academic Affairs Subcommittee visited the Medical Education and Training Campus in San Antonio to discuss their affiliation status with the Community College of the Air Force.

(3) The Board officers provided their annual outbrief to the SECAF in June (see Section VI).

D. Dr. Hawkins welcomed any comments from the public. There being none, Dr. Hawkins invited Gen Fadok to address the Board.

E. Gen Fadok presented his leadership philosophy, vision and mission, three focus areas, and definition of success for 2012.

(1) Leadership Philosophy: Gen Fadok stressed "People first, mission always." He went on to discuss how commanders who do good jobs taking care of their people will have people who do great jobs taking care of the mission. He stated that both people and mission were his responsibilities as the unit leader and that creating a family atmosphere within organizations is equally important because it's all about building better wingmen.

(2) Vision and Mission: Gen Fadok stated that his seven guiding principles were Integrity, Unity of Effort, Initiative, Creativity, Enthusiasm, Perseverance and Civility.

(3) Three Focus Areas: Gen Fadok's three focus areas are to lead the The Air University forward through Education, Research, and Outreach.

(4) Definition of Success for 2012: Finally, Gen Fadok defined success for 2012 as the need for an educational construct based on blended, differentiated, and technologically enabled learning. He said, “Air University needs an operational construct centered on an Air Force PME policy” and that “we need an organizational construct based on an optimized Air University structure.”

F. Strategic Planning Ad Hoc. General (ret) Pat Gamble provided a summary review of the Strategic Planning Ad Hoc group activities and discussions over the summer. Members of the Board are scheduled to meet with the Secretary of the Air Force on 20 January 2012 to discuss Board’s recommendations.

G. As a follow up to the University’s reorganization efforts over the past few years, the Board requested Dr. James Fisher attend the November Board meeting to discuss the reorganization actions and provide an assessment for the ‘way ahead.’ Dr. Fisher provided a candid discussion with the Board and University leadership concerning the status of the recommendations provided in his previous study from 2007.

H. Tuesday morning, 15 November 2011, four of the Board’s subcommittees met to discuss the academic affairs, technology, research, and institutional advancement functions of the University. Each of the subcommittees provided their report and recommendations to the full Board on Tuesday afternoon, 15 November 2011. Approved recommendations from the Board are listed in Section IV of these minutes and subcommittee meeting summaries are provided in Section VII.

I. The Board’s requests, observations, and recommendations were presented to Gen Fadok on Tuesday, 15 November 2011, and are included in Sections IV of these minutes.

J. Dr. Hawkins asked for concluding remarks. There being none, the meeting was adjourned at 5:00 p.m. on Tuesday, 15 November 2011.

Section III: Board Actions

A. **April 2011 BOV Meeting Minutes.** The Board approved the April 2011 Meeting Minutes on 19 May 2011.

B. **Future Meeting Dates.** The Board approved the next meeting date of 16 – 17 April 2012 to be held at Air University, Maxwell AFB, AL.

C. **Bylaws.** The Board reviewed the Bylaws over the summer and requested minor modifications. The Board requested that their support for advocacy be added to the Bylaws.

D. **Review of Mission Statement, Fiscal Stability, Institutional Policies, and Foundations.** The Board reviewed the current and proposed mission statement of the University and approved the mission statement. The Board also reviewed the fiscal stability, institutional policies and the AU Foundation with recommendations, if any, listed in Section IV of these minutes.

E. **Academic Policies** (e.g. faculty hiring, curriculum, program changes). The Board reviewed the policies and procedures for faculty data, curriculum and program changes with recommendations, if any, listed in Section IV of these minutes.

F. **Board Officers.** In accordance with the Bylaws, Mr. Norm Augustine will assume the role of Board Chair on 1 January 2012 and Dr. Muriel Howard will become the BOV Chair Elect.

G. **Board Recommendations.** The Board provided several new recommendations which are reflected in Section IV of these minutes.

H. **Board Resolution Certificate.** The Board Chair presented Dr. Tito Guerrero the Resolution Certificate on Monday afternoon on the occasion of his last meeting as a member of the BOV. Dr. Guerrero was also presented the Air Force Scroll of Appreciation from the Secretary of the Air Force for his dedication and service to the Air University and the U.S. Air Force.

I. **Assessment with AU Commander and President.** The Board officers met with the AU Commander and President to conduct their assessment (as required by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools and BOV Bylaws).

Section IV: Board Requests, Observations, and Recommendations

(Numbering Key: MM/YYYY/##)

A. Future Agenda Requests:

Request 11-2011-01: Request an update of the Academic Council process to include working groups (university or center levels) and how the process funnels up to Board level (senior civilian faculty) up to Council level (university leadership).

Request 11-2011-02: Request the Blue Horizons Report be briefed to the AF CSAF and the SECAF as well as to the BOV at the next meeting, follow by discussion time.

B. Observations:

Observation 11-2011-01: The BOV is concerned that the new AFIT Chancellor position requirements may be too restrictive to attract a robust applicant pool.

C. Recommendations:

Recommendation 11-2011-15: The Air Force will need upgrades to doctrine, officer professional education, legal research, and a huge new focus on intellectual recruitment, education and training. Because of this investment, retention will have to be paramount.

Recommendation 11-2011-16: The thinking and planning has to be focused well ahead of time into a service-level effort in order to effectively backup an AF claim regarding ownership of a high technology war-fighting future.

Recommendation 11-2011-17: Leadership development will be every bit as vital a component as it is today...and maybe more so in a much more technically complex future. The future AF will demand the skills of AF PhDs who are applying cutting edge, highly classified physics, mathematics and engineering to absolutely new methods and means of war fighting.

Recommendation 11-2011-18: The AU board suggested first and foremost that there has to be crystal-like clarity on the Air Force's future mission, and then equal clarity on the education and the associated investment strategy to make it happen. That said, we also respectfully commend to you AU's remarkable intellectual wherewithal to help create that strategy.

Recommendation 11-2011-19: Recommend that distance learning system requirements and priorities be agreed upon in the context of blended learning and use these to move forward in acquiring and deploying an initial comprehensive learning management solution that meets those requirements.

Recommendation 11-2011-20: The Board approved the revised Squadron Officer School program, but remain concerned that some wing commanders are requiring completion of the distance learning Squadron Officer School as a prerequisite to the residential program. Recommend AU develop a business case for converting an entire program to blended learning. Include program effectiveness, assessment of learning outcomes, student satisfaction, cost

effectiveness, cost savings, throughput, sustainability and other issues such as technology changes needed for support in this analysis.

Recommendation 11-2011-21: Determine if METC's affiliation with CCAF is still possible through a memorandum of understanding, active participation in new governance structure, temporary internal waiver for instructor qualifications or other potential options and report to the AU BOV.

Recommendation 11-2011-22: The Board recommended four nominees for consideration for the 2012 honorary degree presentation.

Recommendation 11-2011-23: The Board recommended final resolution be given to the 28 recommendations contained in the study provided by Dr. James Fisher.

Recommendation 11-2011-24: The Board commended Air University on the quality of this institution and recognizes the transformational shift of AU, particularly with regards to blended learning, research and recommended consideration be given to change the name of the University. The Board also suggested AU research who their most famous graduates have been to highlight the University's name.

Recommendation 11-2011-25: We acknowledge the decision to abandon further use of OutStart. This validates our original concern about critical path dependencies on externally-licensed products. As such, we wish to modify Observation 11-2010-06 into a recommendation: AU should have a formal, repeatable process to evaluate risks associated with the licensing and/or operation of 3rd-party products that are on critical paths for AU missions. That process should include evaluation of backups, "hot spares," escrow alternatives, and other alternatives. The BOV wishes to see a report on the development and details of this process.

Section V: Status on Previous Meeting Requests, Observations, and Recommendations

(Numbering Key: MM/YYYY/##)

A. Future Agenda Requests:

Request 04-2011-01: Request a future visit of the AU BOV to METC in conjunction with a regular board meeting.

AU Response: Concur. Members of the Academic Affairs Subcommittee conducted a working group visit to METC in August 2011. The information from this visit will be discussed during the November 2011 Board meeting. **Recommended Action: CLOSED.**

Request 11-2010-07: The November 2010 meeting included an Executive Summary for faculty data; however, the Academic Affairs Working Group requested this data be briefed during the April 2011 meeting.

AU Response: Concur. However, since the April 2011 Board meeting was held at AFIT and much of the agenda was dedicated to AFIT programs, the faculty data was presented during the Academic Affairs Subcommittee meeting in November 2011. **Recommended Action: CLOSED.**

Request 04-2009-07: The Enlisted-to-AFIT program is currently being reviewed by USAF senior leadership to ensure that the requirements generation, selection, and assignments processes are operating effectively. At future meetings of the AFIT Subcommittee of the Air University Board of Visitors, we requested that AFIT report the assignments given to enlisted AFIT graduates from 2009 forward.

AU Response: Concur. Assignment information was provided to the Board in response to the April meeting minutes and will be provided during each subcommittee meeting. **Recommended Action: OPEN.**

B. Observations:

Observation 11-2010-06: Use of "OutStart" presents some interesting opportunities but may also present a next generation lock-in. We suggest exploration of "safety valves" such as source code escrow and dual implementations.

AU Response: In June 2011, AU discontinued pursuing the usage of the Learning Content Management System, OutStart. The decision was driven by OutStart's new pricing model. The cost for additional usage capability and associated technical and maintenance support rose to \$430K annually. This is in addition to the \$43K AETC would pay for renewal maintenance. **Recommended Action: CLOSED. See new Recommendation 11-2011-25.**

Observation 11-2010-08: The Board addressed the mission of the Air University to influence and inform by suggesting the following: 1) Create the logo by policy to make “The Air University” primary and all other AU organizations subordinate when appearing in print; 2) Create stronger loyalty of AU graduates; 3) Engage more aggressively in outreach by pushing more communication under the AU name in such venues as the web’s “TED-ideas worth spreading”; and or 4) Participate more broadly in scholarly lectures and symposia under the Air University banner.

AU Response: Concur. Responses are provided for each of the areas below. **Recommended Action:** Monitor.

1) Create the logo by policy to make “The Air University” primary and all other AU organizations subordinate when appearing in print.

Immediate action: AU will issue a policy letter requiring academic centers, schools, and all other subordinate units to place The AU shield/logo and name in the position of prominence on all printed material, websites, and other visual media. The subordinate unit could place its shield/logo in a subordinate position, using smaller font, on the same materials. “AU Branding” template slides will be revised to reflect the new AU slide template and re-issued with the policy letter. All speakers will be directed to use The Air University brand on printed materials, visual media, and slide templates when making presentations to outside audiences. The AU Policy letter has been drafted and is being coordinated for signature. The Academic Affairs office is collaborating with the Commander’s Action Group to develop branding template slides for the Commander and President.

2) Create stronger loyalty of AU graduates.

Provide support and visibility, to the degree authorized for private organizations, to the Air University Foundation to enable creation and sustainment of an AU Alumni Association. Use successful National Defense University and Army War College Alumni Associations as benchmarks. Currently, resource constraints hinder the development of an AU Alumni Association but it will remain an item of interest when the foundation is able to hire additional manpower to develop, execute and manage an association.

3) Engage more aggressively in outreach by pushing more communication under the AU name in such venues as the web’s “TED-ideas worth spreading”

AU encourages faculty members to produce podcasts, webcasts, etc for placement on YouTube, TED: Ideas worth spreading, AU Facebook, etc. The Air University Television Office is currently providing opportunity for a YouTube presence for news as well as podcasts <http://www.maxwell.af.mil/news/podcasts> and webcasts under the auspices of distance learning. AU Public Affairs has an official Facebook page <http://www.facebook.com/MaxwellAFB> and an official Twitter account <http://twitter.com/MaxwellAFB> that can be used to promote speakers and other image-building events.

The Air Force Research Institute (AFRI) is developing a video series based on developing graduate-level writing skills. This program is currently offered to Spaatz Center students each year. Three of 35 episodes have been recorded as of September 2011. Episodes will be put on

the AFRI website <http://afri.au.af.mil/>. In addition, AFRI dedicated websites for information and electronic publications are used by over 171K customers in 160 countries.

4) Participate more broadly in scholarly lectures and symposia under the Air University banner.

The use of the Global Learning Forum has led to several national spotlights showcasing the innovations of Air Force educators spanning across such examples as invites to speak at the National Academies sponsored by the Gordon Institute, Modeling Virtual Environments and Simulation Institute at the Naval Post Graduate School, and the Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers. The AFRI builds national and international partnerships through research support, conferences, marketing and electronic and print media. Also, Air War College is launching a new lecture series to highlight the talents of the Grand Strategy Program students. This series will be marketed to colleges and universities throughout the United States.

C. Recommendations:

Recommendation 04-2011-01: The Board recommended approval of the new CCAF AAS degree program in Cyber Security.

AU Response: Concur. Action complete. **Recommended Action: CLOSED.**

Recommendation 04-2011-02: The Board recommended “disaffiliation” status for the 94th Operations Group, Dobbins AFB, GA. Their mission has changed from training to operations effective March 2011.

AU Response: Concur. Action complete. **Recommended Action: CLOSED.**

Recommendation 04-2011-03: The Board recommended “affiliation” status for the 118th Operations Group, Air National Guard, Nashville, TN. Their mission is to train C-130 Loadmasters and Flight Engineers.

AU Response: Concur. Action complete. **Recommended Action: CLOSED.**

Recommendation 04-2011-04: The Board recommended approval to realign the United States Air Force Special Operations School under the Air Force Special Operations Training Center, Hurlburt Field, FL.

AU Response: Concur. Action complete. **Recommended Action: CLOSED.**

Recommendation 04-2011-05: Recent efficiency measures in OSD have resulted in conversion of the position of Commandant of AFIT from a general officer to a Senior Executive Service (SES) civilian. This change can have positive impact, especially the opportunity for more continuity of leadership of this strategically important university. It will be critical, however, especially for the first civilian leader, that the individual be carefully chosen because of the cultural and other impacts this change will stimulate. For this reason, it is strongly recommended that SECAF use existing Title 10 authority to fill this position using the Administratively Determined (AD) faculty schedule. The Commander, Air University, currently has delegated authority to use this schedule and it seems that by using the AD Senior Manager

authority, it will be more likely that an appropriate person could be attracted and would allow more flexibility than exists in the SES schedule.

AU Response: Concur. Based on the discussion with the SECAF during the BOV's outbrief, there is general agreement to pursue an AD position to provide the flexibility in hiring as well as greater ability to find a person with the needed qualifications. Vacancy advertised on USAJOBS 20 Oct 11 as an AD position. **Recommended Action: CLOSED.**

Recommendation 04-2011-06: The AU BOV understands that difficult decisions have to be made as the Air Force must reduce the number of active duty general officer positions. We are disappointed that the AFIT Commandant general officer position was selected for elimination, and our concern centers primarily around the potential that an unintended message may be received by members of the Air Force that AFIT and graduate technical education including advanced research, are not as important to the Air Force as they once were. In order to ensure that the technical future of the Air Force remains sound, the AU BOV recommends that the SECAF, the CSAF, and other Air Force senior leaders regularly emphasize, and widely communicate, the critical role that advanced technical education plays in the future combat capability of our Air Force and the vital role that AFIT plays in providing that technical education.

AU Response: Concur. During the 2011 AU BOV briefing to the SECAF, the role of AFIT was appropriately emphasized. Subsequent to this outbrief, the SECAF visited AFIT. In addition, AFIT developed a Strategic Communications Plan which establishes objectives to ensure AFIT effectively communicates with target audiences in direct support of their mission.

Recommended Action: CLOSED.

Recommendation 04-2011-07: In light of the Air Force changes in AFIT leadership, the AU BOV recommends that the Academic Affairs Subcommittee (in coordination with the AFIT Subcommittee) review and recommend to the AU Commander and President appropriate organizational titles and structure. We suggest that AU leadership/administration obtain a perspective from SACS and North Central Association for Higher Learning Council relative to their thoughts regarding AU's structure. This should be considered at the next subcommittee meeting in November 2011.

AU Response: Based on discussions during the April 2011 BOV meeting at AFIT, and discussion between AU senior leadership and Headquarters Air Force, the decision was to establish the AFIT senior civilian leader position as an Administratively Determined (AD) position to facilitate flexibility in hiring the most qualified candidate. Additionally, the position will be titled Chancellor. **Recommended Action: CLOSED.**

Recommendation 04-2011-08: Recommend AU provide funding and support for the AFIT research and laboratory facilities

AU Response: Concur. Sustainment restoration and moderation (SRM) on facilities is the responsibility of the host base, which for AFIT is Wright-Patterson AFB (WPAFB). There is a process at each host base for funding facility projects. At WPAFB, this process includes 10 voting members (major organizations on base) of which AFIT is a member. In the last two

years, WPAFB has funded the several SRM projects for AFIT. In addition, AU and AETC also provide funding for AFIT's SRM projects. **Recommended Action: CLOSED.**

Recommendation 04-2011-09: Recommend that the Air University leadership work closely with the Medical Education and Training Campus (METC) Commander to ensure that METC faculty meet instructor qualifications for CCAF affiliation requirements. Consider pursuing an official, written memorandum of agreement to codify the commitment of the current METC Commander to meet CCAF faculty standards.

AU Response: Concur. METC has made great strides in correcting deficiencies previously identified during the August 2010 visit. During a site visit in August 2011, METC was compliant on all 48 items on the candidacy visit checklist. Members of the AU BOV Academic Affairs Subcommittee visited METC on 25 August 2011 in conjunction with CCAF's site visit and plans to discuss METC's candidacy/affiliation status during the November Board meeting. **Recommended Action: OPEN.**

Recommendation 04-2011-10: Recommend AU formally monitor distance learning to (1) assure the learning is at least as good as face-to-face experience, particularly in such areas as leadership; and (2) identify changes that may make distance learning even more effective than it now appears to be.

AU Response: Concur. The learning outcomes for AU professional military education programs are usually written at higher achievement levels for the resident programs than for their distance learning (DL) counterparts. The primary reason is that there is a significantly different expectation for the amount of time a student should spend to complete the distance learning program. Resident program students attend the school full time, and have no distractions; this allows greater depth and involvement. Distance-learning students accomplish their studies around a regular work schedule, giving them only segments of time to complete their studies. A second reason for the difference between programs is cost—the distance learning programs involve vastly more students, so keeping costs to a minimum is essential, which usually means sacrificing depth and breadth to fit within a more constrained budget.

There are AU programs where learning objectives are parallel between resident and distance learning delivery methods. One is the Online Facilitated Master's Program conducted by the Air Command and Staff College. Others fall primarily into the Professional Continuing Education area. In these cases, the program outcomes are the same, and the program evaluations and measures are the same. These courses generally cost more to execute because they involve some form of faculty/instructor facilitation and additional educational technology that supports both media delivery and inter-student collaboration. The outcomes of these courses are reviewed by the Centers during annual course reviews, and reported biennially as part of the educational program review board process. We also provided a report to our meeting with the Command Board of Advisors (CBOA) last January, with a follow-up discussion scheduled in our next meeting.

One of AU's strategic focus areas is to leverage blended learning across AU programs, and the Vice President for Academic Affairs (VPAA) has been assigned oversight responsibilities. VPAA will chair a central committee tied to the AU corporate process which will include the recently-created Senior Academic Technology Officer (SATO) position to align resources, goals, and paybacks between resident and DL methods. **Recommended Action: OPEN.**

Recommendation 04-2011-11: Recommend an assessment of how AFIT's management program relates to activities at Defense Systems Management University.

AU Response: Concur. The Defense Systems Management College (DSMC) is a part of Defense Acquisition University (DAU), and they have a "School for Program Managers." DAU courses generally are taught at the DOD (Joint) level and are typically geared towards Acquisition Professional Development Program (APDP) certification. While AFIT's School of Systems and Logistics (AFIT/LS) does not have a "management program," it does provide some short courses that are targeted for Program Managers, which is just a portion of our overall portfolio. However, AFIT/LS course material is generally geared more towards Air-Force specific training and is generally not required for APDP certification. Additionally, on a case-by-case basis, some AFIT/LS courses are granted DAU APDP certification status through a process called "equivalency" or "fulfillment." In such cases, DAU has a third-party, rigorous review process to evaluate AFIT/LS courses and objectives to determine if equivalency is appropriate (an example is AFIT Fundamentals of Acquisition Management 103 is equivalent to DAU Acquisition 101). We typically apply for equivalency when the AF need is greater than DAU capacity. We continually evaluate our courses for appropriateness of DAU equivalency.

Recommended Action: CLOSED.

Recommendation 04-2011-12: Monitor cyber curriculum and research as it relates to a large number of new related projects elsewhere in DoD to avoid gaps and unnecessary overlaps.

BOV Update Nov 2011: The committee acknowledges and is pleased with the comprehensive efforts that are currently underway to keep cyber curriculum current with appropriate agencies and groups. However, we request that the status of this item be listed as "Monitor" with a biannual status check planned.

AU Response: Concur. The Center for Cyberspace Research (CCR), under the academic direction of the Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering, has and continues to fully vet its academic and research directions with various leadership sources within the Air Force, DoD, and Federal Government. Since 2003, the CCR has convened a semi-annual meeting of senior cyber security leaders from industry, academia, and government to ensure the relevance and direction of each emphasis area. In 2008, the Air Force established the Cyberspace Education Board of Advisors to support the CCR efforts and to direct, as necessary, to respond to emerging changes/issues in the cyber domain.

Additionally, the CCR works with national level agencies such as the National Security Agency (NSA), the Department of Homeland Security (DHS), and the Department of Energy (DoE) to conduct cutting-edge research and to transition these advances into the graduate curricula. The CCR works closely with the United States Cyber Command (USCC) to develop and hone both graduate education and professional continuing education to meet the growing needs of the DoD. Further, CCR-affiliated faculty support international working groups such as the IFIP 11.9 Digital Forensics and IFIP 11.10 Critical Infrastructure Protection. Participation in these working groups allows CCR-affiliated faculty access to emerging technological capabilities and fosters collaboration among leading researchers.

Since its inception, the CCR and its affiliated faculty have worked with leading cyber researchers from across the Air Force (Air Force Research Laboratory and the 24th Air Force), national

laboratories (Idaho National Laboratory, Oak Ridge National Laboratory, Pacific Northwest National Laboratory, and Sandia National Laboratory), and national agencies (NSA, DHS, and DoE) to cultivate partnerships that minimize overlap in efforts and seek to ensure research gaps are being filled. Lastly, the CCR works with industry via Cooperative Research and Development Agreements to assist in the rapid transitions of technologies for operational successes and product development that meets the needs of the nation. CCR continues to expand its national partnerships for relevance and high return-on-investment academic and research results.

As a result of these extensive collaborations and ongoing semi-annual reviews by cyber leaders within the Air Force, DoD, and Federal Government, the recommended monitoring of cyber curriculum and research has and continues to take place and be very effective. **Recommended Action: AU BOV request status as MONITOR; with biannual status check.**

Recommendation 04-2011-13: AFIT is a complex organization with a multi-faceted mission and a broad array of stakeholders, sponsors, and customers. Communicating and advocating the AFIT story, especially within the AF, is critically important in our resource-constrained environment, and must be done at multiple levels in both a tailored and persistent manner. Sustained advocacy, especially with the relatively frequent turnover of senior AF decision-makers, seems critical to AFIT's future. The AU BOV recommends AFIT develop a strategic advocacy plan and a process for executing that plan and measuring the effectiveness of that execution. Such a strategy and its execution will require resources in terms of people and budget, and may take special functional expertise to be most effective. The AFIT Subcommittee has observed past efforts by commandants to interact with senior stakeholders and has endorsed those initiatives. The spirit of this recommendation is to make strategic advocacy an organizational priority, institutionalize it for sustained implementation and resource it to the maximum extent possible.

AU Response: Concur. AFIT has reinvented itself when it comes to strategic planning. The previous commandant, Maj Gen Walter Givhan, fully agreed and the current commandant, Col Timothy Lawrence, is moving ahead full steam. The commandant created a team using both directors and staff to create a complete Strategic Communications Plan Instruction, a strategic plan going forward from 2011 to 2014, and a strategic planning report to be used as a handout. **Recommended Action: CLOSED.**

Recommendation 04-2011-14: Recommend AFIT leadership prepare and maintain a "Did you Know?" sheet of items discovered or brought to practice because of AFIT efforts, in whole or part. Try to focus on major items that show impact on AF mission to include measures of that impact, if possible. Include this as a standard handout material to distinguished visitors and others.

AU Response: Concur. Based upon the feedback from 19 May 2011 Board of Visitors Meeting Minutes AFIT has come up with a new approach to the "Did you know?" We have created a package for distinguished visitors and others which includes "We are AFIT" hard copy handouts, strategic plan, research report and annual review. Recently, the AFIT Commandant handed these packages out to members in congress on the commandant's annual trip to Capitol Hill, which was very well received.

AFIT is also creating a PowerPoint document to be placed on our social media Facebook page that will highlight AFIT's Air Force mission impact and will be easy to update as AFIT creates new success in our history. The anticipated completion date is April 2012. This document will include examples such as the development and teaching of the Cyber 200/300 professional development courses; AFIT's development of cryptographic software protection technology, code name ESCAPE; and AFIT research in counter-IED (Improvised Explosive Device). This document will go through an annual review and updated in order to keep AFIT's impact on the AF mission highlighted.

Lastly we have had an aggressive campaign in the media. Currently we are averaging three stories per month in the local base newspaper and one TV news article as well as radio interviews about different projects that are going on at AFIT. **Recommended Action: CLOSED.**

Recommendation 11-2010-16: Change the title of the AU Chief Academic Officer to Vice President for Academic Affairs. This change would be consistent with other institutions of higher education while permitting the option for center commanders of degree-granting schools to establish a chief academic officer position. Recommend AU not establish any other position as Vice President for Academic Affairs (with exception of AFIT).

AU Response: Concur. The Chief Academic Officer is now titled the "Vice President for Academic Affairs." **Recommended Action: CLOSED.**

Recommendation 11-2010-17: Establish an Academic Council (minus AFIT) chaired by the Vice President for Academic Affairs and composed of chief academic officers/educational advisors from each center and a senior faculty member appointed by the Vice President for Academic Affairs. A charter should be created defining the role of the council and the council should review and provide recommendations concerning new programs and or substantive program changes to the responsible center commander for approval. The center commanders will then forward any new program or substantive program change requiring submission/ notification to the AU Commander for approval. The AU Commander will obtain AU Board of Visitors approval prior to submission to the accrediting agency.

AU Response: Partially Concur. The relevant AU Instruction (AUI) will be revised to account for an academic council process. However, in order to be consistent with other AU corporate processes, the AUI will specify the Academic Council as the governing council chaired by the AU Commander and President with members including the Vice President for Academic Affairs, Financial Management Director, Plans Director, Communication Director and commanders, or their equivalent, from the following AU centers and organizations: Spaatz, Barnes, Holm, Eaker, LeMay, Air Force Research Institute, and School for Advanced Air and Space Studies. These members will constitute the voting body.

The AUI will also specify the Academic Board as headed by the Chief of Academic Affairs, with members including each center/school senior education administrator and deans from the AU colleges and schools. Lastly, the AUI will establish working groups at the centers and schools as needed to address curriculum, institutional effectiveness, faculty management, and other issues. The AUI will also address processes and procedures for addressing a range of issues affecting the academic well being of the university to include faculty, curriculum change, and the like. **Recommended Action: OPEN.**

Recommendation 11-2010-18: Decisions/authority for course level curriculum and non-credit courses be at the program/center level. However, new program or substantive program changes requiring submission/notification to the accrediting agency be reviewed by the AU Academic Council for recommendations to the responsible center commander for approval. The center commanders will then forward any new program or substantive program change requiring submission/notification to the AU Commander for approval. The AU Commander will obtain AU Board of Visitors approval prior to submission to the accrediting agency.

AU Response: Partially Concur. The relevant AU Instruction will be revised to account for an academic council process. However, in order to be consistent with other AU corporate processes, the AUI will specify the Academic Council as the governing council chaired by the AU Commander and President with members including the Vice President for Academic Affairs, Financial Management Director, Plans Director, Communication Director and commanders, or their equivalent, from the following AU centers and organizations: Spatz, Barnes, Holm, Eaker, LeMay, Air Force Research Institute, and School for Advanced Air and Space Studies. These members will constitute the voting body.

The AUI will also specify the Academic Board as headed by the Vice President for Academic Affairs with members including each center/school senior education administrator. Lastly, the AUI will establish working groups at the centers and schools as needed to address curriculum, institutional effectiveness, faculty management, and other issues. The AUI will also address processes and procedures for addressing a range of issues affecting the academic well being of the university to include faculty, curriculum change, and the like. **Recommended Action: OPEN.**

Recommendation 11-2010-19: AU Commander and President, with advice from the Vice President for Academic Affairs establish policies and procedures for hiring, promotion, reappointment, termination, and appointment of academic rank for the Administratively Determined (AD) civilian faculty. The Vice President for Academic Affairs provides a timely review of final recommendations (provided by center commanders) for compliance with policies and procedures and make recommendations to the AU Commander and President (approval authority).

AU Response: Concur. The recommended policies and procedures actually already exist, but have been under review within AU. Currently, Air Force Instruction (AFI) 36-804, *Civilian Faculty Pay Plan for Air University and the USAF Academy*, covers: Establishing Faculty Pay Schedules, Delegation of Authority to Administer the Faculty Pay Plan, Duties and Titles of Faculty and Administrators, Appointments, Promotions, Academic Rank, Pay Setting, Non-reappointment or Removal, and Civilian Faculty Performance Appraisal, among other things. The AU Supplement 1 to AFI 36-804 goes into more specifics for the areas mentioned above. There is also an Air University Instruction (AUI) 36-2314, *Academic Rank*, which covers: Policy, Criteria for Appointment to Specific Academic Rank, Exception to Criteria of Appointment to Specific Academic Rank, Performance Assessment Criteria, Nomination Procedures, and AU Board of Visitors Notification.

Headquarters Air Force (the Air Staff) is in the process of rewriting AFI 36-804 and will call it AFI 36-116, *Title 10 Civilian Faculty Personnel System*. Note: The publication date of the existing AFI 36-804 is 29 April 1994. AD faculty fall under United States Code Title 10. Since

the old and new AFIs affect just Air University and the U.S. Air Force Academy, the Air Staff has given AU and USAFA the opportunity to provide an AU-USAFA agreed-upon draft of the new AFI 36-116 for Air Staff's assessment. There have been a number of meetings, video teleconferences, and teleconversations between AU and USAFA. The desire is to get the new AFI published within the next few months.

The current policies and procedures have the AU Commander and President as the approval authority for AD actions, with recommendation from the Vice President for Academic Affairs after reviewing final recommendations from center commanders. The AU Commander's desire is to have that process remain in place in the new AFI. Once the new AFI 36-116 is published, a revised AU Supplement 1 to AFI 36-116 and a revised AUI 36-2314 will be published.

Recommended Action: OPEN.

Recommendation 11-2010-25: The Board recommended approval of the Substantive Change Type 2 (relocating a campus) for the 882nd Training Group from Sheppard AFB to Fort Sam Houston, TX. However, the Board remains concerned for the continuance of college credit for the Air Force enlisted members and therefore requests notification in the event the 882nd Training Group leadership is no longer the administrative authority for the 68 medical courses and for the 205 faculty members.

AU Response: Concur. We will notify the Board should the AF training group administrative authority for the 68 Air Force medical courses and faculty changes. **Recommended Action: MONITOR.**

Recommendation 11-2010-26: AF leadership support latitude to experiment with (and operate) emerging and mainstream educational technology that will not necessarily match current AF technology (and policy). This is required to keep the educational leaders of the AF at the cutting edge of education technology and thus keeping the AF in the lead.

AU Response: Concur. AU leadership recognizes the ongoing challenges with supporting an innovation culture for experimenting with and operating emerging and mainstream educational technologies. Emerging educational technologies can be particularly difficult to experiment with and operate due to the challenges to existing organizational culture, demands, and cost structures. Regardless of such challenges, however, the Air Force is facing future learning environments requiring the need to educate Airmen with the capacity to learn faster and adapt more quickly to changing demands of war fighting where knowledge, critical-thinking skills, and performance are required in unforgiving circumstances. Air University positioned the Air Force to better anticipate, experiment, and implement emerging educational technologies, with the establishment of the Innovations and Integrations Division. This division is staffed with professionals offering expertise in fostering innovation cultures among educators for experimenting with and operating emerging and mainstream educational technology and for assisting AU leadership to determine how best to support the evaluation and impact of digital literacy and emerging new media technology to meet current and future learning needs of Airmen. A Global Learning Forum was created and has grown on a global scale to include over 300 educators engaging in Air Force educational technology prototyping and assessment of learning impact. Leading experts from around the world in learning and assessment sciences research, mobile learning, digital literacy, and the use of new media with educational technology for developing critical thinking skills and adaptive expertise, have been paired with Air Force educators on several prototyping projects. Faculty educational technology prototyping efforts

have been highlighted in national publications showcasing innovations in DoD education. AU also launched an annual innovations report to better anticipate and target emerging educational technologies for prototyping. Information and discernment obtained from the innovations report feeds into the educational technology strategic plan processes for supporting the overall strategic goals of Air University. **Recommended Action: CLOSED.**

Recommendation 11-2010-28: There are some educational tasks that cannot be executed as .mil and require full conversion to .edu domain. Recommend a risk analysis of the conversion required and the allocated resources to make the move. Ultimately, a cost savings may be realized.

AU Response: Concur. AU will attend a conference in October 2011 to define a vision for Air Force .EDU Networks and will provide an update on this issue during the Future Learning and Technology Subcommittee meeting in November. **Recommended Action: OPEN.**

Recommendation 11-2010-29: Need to prioritize the finalization of the fix to the CDSAR repairs/upgrade. The system is working again, but our understanding is that the full scope of a replacement and fix including full off-site hot spares has not been funded or installed.

BOV Update Nov 2011: The committee is pleased to see progress being made on the replacement and upgrade of this system. However, we are not ready to consider this issue as closed as there are still outstanding modifications scheduled into next year. We wish to be informed about continuing progress in the upgrade of CDSAR, and will reconsider the status of the observation after the upgrades are completed.

AU Response: Concur. The CDSAR R&R Phase II (COBOL/C to Java) was successfully released on 22 Aug 2011 and the update from Oracle 8i to 10G is scheduled in October 2011. These updates will totally remove CDSAR (application and database) from the old and unreliable Unix server. Phase III will modularize the CDSAR system to prevent failure of the entire system if one component fails. This phase is funded at \$1.2M and is scheduled for completion in September 2012. **Recommended Action: AU BOV request status as OPEN.**

Recommendation 11-2010-30: Develop a plan to design, fund, install, test, and operate the technology to handle expanded enrollment and distance education for the full enterprise.

AU Response: Concur. Program Objective Memorandum submissions have been included in AU's enterprise planning to obtain fiscal support, across multiple years, for the continued conversion of existing systems, enterprise development, installation, testing, and sustainment costs envisioned for handling expanded enrollment and distance education for the full enterprise. **Recommended Action: MONITOR.**

Recommendation 11-2010-33: Recommend the quality of the physical training center at Gunter Annex be raised up to acceptable standards.

AU Response: Concur. The existing Gunter Fitness Center, Bldg. 800, was constructed in 1943 as an aircraft maintenance hangar and converted to its current use in the 1960s. The facility is severely undersized, costly to maintain, and experiences continual problems with moisture, mold, temperatures, etc.

We have programmed a military construction (MILCON) project to construct a new fitness center to replace the old facility. The new state-of-the-art fitness center is planned at over three times the current size, at 62,000 SF, and is estimated to cost \$15.5M. The project has been submitted to AETC as AU's #1 Priority MILCON. In strict competition with the other 18 wings in AETC, it ranks as high as #4 in the command. However, in the current fiscal environment, funding through the normal MILCON process is doubtful.

We advocate heavily for the new fitness center with our Congressional Delegates and Air Force leadership whenever we get the opportunity. In the past year we have received visits from Congresswoman Martha Roby, and staffers for Senators Richard Shelby and Jeff Sessions and Congressman Mike Rogers. During each visit we provide detailed information on the project and its condition, and offer tours of the facility. We will continue to advocate for the MILCON project at every opportunity.

In the interim, we have completed projects to repair and refurbish the HVAC, upgrade finishes, and replace flooring. Additionally, when the new Gunter Commissary is complete in FY13, we plan to convert a portion of the old Gunter Commissary to a Fitness Center Annex.

Recommended Action: MONITOR.

Recommendation 11-2010-34: Recommend Air University establish a Leadership/Ethics Chair along with plans to create a Leadership/Ethics Center in order to bring attention to the Air University.

AU Response: Partially Concur. Due to fiscal and manning constraints, AU will not be able to pursue a Leadership and Ethics Center at this time; however, the AU Foundation has prepared a requirements package to establish an endowed Distinguished Chair of Leadership and Ethics at Air University and is currently seeking funding for this position. **Recommended Action: MONITOR.**

Recommendation 04-2010-02: The Board recommended AU continue to develop and resource a robust distance learning program (e.g. the online masters degree platform, now referred to as the Facilitated ACSC Distance Learning Program) to support AU educational programs for enlisted and officer training to include active duty, guard, and reserve personnel. AU should also seek "system-wide" efficiencies in distance learning, and in other systems with particular emphasis on enlisted courses.

AU Response: Concur. With the stand-up of the online master degree program (Facilitated ACSC DL Program), AU has learned a significant amount on how to leverage Commercial Off The Shelf (COTS) Learning Management Systems (LMS) and the need for COTS to interface with our organic Student Management Systems (SMS) from an enrollment, registration, grades, transcription...etc basis. In addition, AU instituted policy for some COTS software to be implemented as enterprise solutions for the entire university. With the renewed focus and funding within the Barnes Center to update enlisted distance learning (DL) content and the need for other AU schools to update content and migrate their distance learning programs to online offering, efforts are underway to institute an AU Distance Learning Coordination Committee. This committee will determine enterprise-wide DL business processes and the supporting technologies/systems to execute the expected learning outcomes. A Program Objective Memorandum (POM) submission has been submitted to support this long-term effort; however, at this time we do not know whether funding will be allocated in the out years to support this

worthwhile goal. In the meantime, we will continue to collect requirements and build the way ahead so we are prepared should funding become available. **Recommended Action: MONITOR.**

Recommendation 04-2010-06: Since the Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP) is one of the 12 Core Requirements of regional accreditation, the Board recommended AU maintain efforts toward accomplishment of the QEP and provide updates to the Board including how each academic unit is implementing the QEP.

AU Response: Concur. On 25 October 2011 the AU's QEP will undergo its annual Educational Program Review, chaired by the Commander and President of Air University. This process will summarize efforts from year two of the Plan's implementation (2010-2011), then address plans for the current Academic Year (2011-2012). The "bottom line" of the Review is that all key educational and support efforts required for the QEP are in place and on track. Further, AU's Plan is meeting most of the goals we set for learning outcomes, with periodic modifications occurring to ensure our targets are challenging yet feasible; with seven schools now participating, the Plan is being implemented across the majority of the continuum of education; throughput of junior enlisted Airmen is increasing via the Community College of the Air Force course; assessment efforts are becoming increasingly robust and integrated, although some challenges due to the scale of the Plan persist.

As the Plan has grown, additional mechanisms have been implemented, permitting easier tracking of progress. For example, we can now report that this academic year (the third year of implementation), all Phase I schools (Community College of the Air Force, Officer Training School, Squadron Officer College) are entering the Sustainment Stage; three Phase II schools (International Officer School, Air Command and Staff College, Senior NCO Academy) have begun the Expansion Stage early; and the remaining two Phase II schools (Air War College, NCO Academy) are starting the Needs Assessment/Infusion Stage according to plan.

However, curricular revisions and assessment of student learning outcomes are only two of the Plan's five lines of activities. Equally important is the hiring of new specialized faculty. Last academic year, replacements for two key departed faculty members were brought on board. Further, thanks to an Air Force exemption of faculty from the Service-wide hiring freeze, searches are now underway to fill the final three positions envisioned by the QEP. We anticipate these individuals will be in place by summer 2012, providing the minimum group of scholars necessary to successfully implement/assess Phase II of the Plan.

The fourth line of activity, professional development, is necessary to ensure that non-expert faculty members can integrate appropriate cross-cultural materials to core courses in ways that support achieving the Plan's student learning outcomes. In summer 2011, six AU faculty/staff attended specialized courses off-site to prepare them for this challenge, a decrease from the previous year due to funding limitations. Given the increased cadre of specialized faculty now in place, we plan to organize a suite of professional development workshops at AU in summer 2012 to reduce this cost and better tailor the instruction. The final line of activity, research leading to the development of learning resources, has benefited from Air Force projects such as field guides and interactive videos in support of operations in Afghanistan and Building Partnership activities.

Finally, two previously mentioned challenges have been resolved: First, the Cultural Studies Project received Institutional Review Board approval from the Air Force Academy. This is permitting the implementation of qualitative assessment practices and the collection of Airmen's cross cultural experiences for infusion to courses. Second, the Air Force Research Laboratory's Human Performance Wing has commenced a study to validate the academic model that underlies the Plan and generate a performance model for all ranks of Airmen. This will help ensure the Plan is properly aligned with Airmen's actual requirements in the field. However, a final challenge previously discussed with the Board, establishing a mechanism to systematically collaborate with senior civilian scholars, has not yet been resolved due to legal and policy challenges. **Recommended Action: MONITOR.**

Recommendation 04-2010-07: The Board recommended AU reinstate the online master's degree program (OLMP, now referred to as the Facilitated ACSC Distance Learning Program) and ensure the AF Chief of Staff and Secretary of the Air Force do all that's possible to maintain the OLMP program.

AU Response: Concur. The Facilitated Air Command and Staff College Distance Learning Program has been restored in the FY12 POM. However, strong advocacy will continue to be required as the FY13 POM (currently being worked) is even more constrained than its predecessor POM. An update will be provided prior to the spring Board meeting.

Recommended Action: MONITOR.

Section VI: SECAF Outbrief Executive Summary, June 2011

During the 2011 academic year, the Board met on several occasions to review various aspects of Air University (AU) to include offering a doctorate in Military Strategy; updates on the mission and future direction; distance learning masters program; and proposed legislative changes affecting the institution. Additionally, several working groups met throughout the year to discuss issues concerning the Air Force Institute of Technology (AFIT), academic affairs, technology, research, honorary degrees, and future board membership. Throughout the year, the Board provided the university with 48 recommendations. Several of the recommendations are highlighted below and the remaining recommendations are detailed in the November 2010 and April 2011 meeting minutes.

PhD Status. The Board recommended Air University submit an application for Level V status with the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS) meaning AU would be able to award a PhD to graduates of the School of Advanced Air and Space Studies. SACS and the Department of Education conducted their site visits during the spring and fully support approval for degree granting.

Strategic Positioning of Air Force Education. The Board approved a small group to review the strategic positioning of AU's educational mission to support the future needs of the nation. Recommendations from this group will be provided to the AU Commander and SECAF in the early summer.

Medical Education and Training Campus (METC). All DoD enlisted medical training will be consolidated at Ft Sam Houston as a result of 2005 BRAC rulings. Recommend AU leadership work closely with the METC Commander to ensure that METC faculty meet instructor qualifications for SACS accreditation requirements to preserve the degree granting status of the Community College of the Air Force.

AFIT Commander's Position. Recent efficiency measures in OSD have resulted in conversion of the position of Commandant of AFIT from a general officer to a senior executive service civilian. The Board strongly recommended the position be filled by existing Title 10 authority for the Administratively Determined (AD) faculty schedule.

Recommend that the SECAF, the CSAF, and other Air Force senior leaders regularly emphasize, and widely communicate, the critical role that advanced technical education plays in the future combat capability of our Air Force and the vital role that AFIT plays in providing that technical education.

AU Commander's Duty Title: The Board appreciates the recent title change of Air University to Commander and President.

Honorary Degree Ceremony. In October 2006, the SECAF authorized the AU Commander to confer honorary degrees to individuals other than those students who fulfill specified degree requirements. Since that time, AU has conferred four degrees. The next Honorary Degree Ceremony is planned for Monday, November 14, 2011, at Maxwell AFB, AL, to recognize Mr. Tom Brokaw for his extraordinary contributions in education, governmental, public service, and community affairs. This day is also the first day of the fall Board of Visitors meeting and the Board would be honored to invite the SECAF to participate in this historic academic ceremony.

Section VII: SECAF Outbrief Executive Summary, January 2012

BACKGROUND

During the April 2011 Air University (AU) Board of Visitors (BOV) meeting, Dr. Jack Hawkins, Board Chair, requested an Ad Hoc group review the strategic positioning of AU's educational mission to support the future needs of the nation and provide recommendations, if any, to the AU Board of Visitors. During the committee's annual outbrief to the Secretary of the Air Force in June 2011, Dr. Hawkins briefed the Ad Hoc group's objectives and the Board's desire to provide a follow up briefing to the Secretary. The group, Chaired by General Pat Gamble (USAF Retired), met on several occasions between June and October 2011 and provide the following observations and recommendations:

OBSERVATIONS

Advances in technology and mission demands in the years ahead will eclipse experience held by the Air Force (AF) in the past. This will place a premium on maintaining a cadre of highly educated, broadly thinking officers. The role of the AU is to produce such individuals...a role that will grow in importance in the years ahead. The Air University Board of Visitors believes *Intellectual Capital is Combat Capital*.

The high (very high) technology infrastructure base is growing more robustly and will become even more sophisticated. It has the potential to dominate the accomplishment of the AF mission. It's everywhere. It can become our strength, if we let it, allowing highly educated and trained AF Airmen to do new missions in new ways never imagined by the "farm boys" of the Great Depression. If we can begin to conceptually agree on what kind of revolution in military affairs (RMA) it would take to dominate the battle space of 2030, we can better continue the quest for true mission superiority. If instead we are tempted to undertake prolonged debate, we should perhaps pose the question to the technologically aware and digitally-adept Class of 2015 at USAFA. But is our growing new strength also becoming our greatest new vulnerability?

Educated Airmen, learned in high technical subject areas, focused through a career of continuing education and experience in the highly technical domains, will rightfully become the commanders and weapons school teachers, leaders, and commanders of a major component of tomorrow's AF. A whole new type of "situational awareness" skill will be called for.

Consider that a cyber-world generation is about 18 months to 3 years. If we identify academically qualified cadets, lieutenants, and captains today, they might be PhDs in 3-8 years. Their theoretical and applied physics, computer science, engineering, mathematics, optics, and operational experience might take another 3-10 years to mature. It could be several generations of computer development cycles before we see the leading edge of an RMA class AF effort at future asymmetry bear first fruit. Where will the training and maturing process take place? To be in the game in 2030, we need the all-star team to be on the practice field now.

RECOMMENDATIONS

- The Air Force will need upgrades to doctrine, officer professional education, legal research, and a huge new focus on intellectual recruitment, education and training. Because of this investment, retention will have to be paramount.
- The thinking and planning has to be focused well ahead of time into a service-level effort in order to effectively backup an AF claim regarding ownership of a high technology war-fighting future.
- Leadership development will be every bit as vital a component as it is today...and maybe more so in a much more technically complex future. The future AF will demand the skills of AF PhDs who are applying cutting edge, highly classified physics, mathematics and engineering to absolutely new methods and means of warfighting.
- The AU board suggests first and foremost that there has to be crystal-like clarity on the Air Force's future mission, and then equal clarity on the education and the associated investment strategy to make it happen. That said, we also respectfully commend to you AU's remarkable intellectual wherewithal to help create that strategy.

Section VIII: Subcommittee(s) Meeting Summary

A. The Academic Affairs and Future Learning and Technology Subcommittees combined their meeting during the November Board meeting. The subcommittee members reviewed the status of academic affairs issues as well as discussed the following topics with various educational advisors throughout the university:

1. Squadron Officer School (SOS) Course: Briefing included changes made to the SOS program as a result of the “CORONA-Top” decision to consolidate Basic and Primary Developmental Education into a single, resident educational experience. Subcommittee understands all academic requirements are being addressed and approves the conceptual changes to SOS.

2. Community College of the Air Force (CCAF): Briefing included current data for affiliated schools; legislative proposals status; and an update on the Medical Education and Training Campus.

3. Distance Learning Imperatives: AU presented a list of imperatives as, essentially, a set of requirements for shaping the design of an AU distance education enterprise system that would help AU best serve the needs of the Air Force and its Airmen in delivering AU academic programs via distance. The next step in the process of defining distance education requirements was to validate the list, and to determine the relative importance of each requirement against the others.

4. Blended/Hybrid Learning: AU delivers educational courseware primarily via resident and correspondence programs, and is exploring how technology can create blended courses that improve and/or bridge both.

B. Research Subcommittee Meeting Summary.

1. The Director of the ACSC Research/Elective program provided an overview of ACSC’s RE program, current research trends and initiatives, and recent publication accomplishments of ACSC graduates. ACSC’s presentation also included a general overview of the Cross Domain Operator elective, a course which exemplifies the unique opportunities ACSC student-researchers have to contribute to the fight by interacting with warfighters in the field.

2. The Air War College briefed the Grand Strategy Program (GSP) and the start of an outreach program called the Hap Arnold Lecture series. In Jan-Feb 12, a select group of AWC students (12) enrolled in the GSP will travel in groups of three students plus one PhD faculty member to present their strategic-level Professional Studies Paper at civilian universities including Washington State, George Washington, and Rutgers as well as Westminster College.

3. The Center for Strategy and Technology discussed the CSAF's Blue Horizons project which is designed to answer questions similar to those addressed in the Air Force 2025 study. These include: What are the emerging technologies that will shape the US Air Force and the conflict arena in which it must operate twenty years in the future? What could air, space, and cyber power look like twenty years in the future? Who will have access to emerging technologies that can make a difference? How soon will these important technological

achievements become fielded systems? The Subcommittee was extremely impressed with the Blue Horizons project and requests this briefing be provided to the AF CSAF and the SECAF as well as at the next BOV meeting.

4. Air Force Research Institute (AFRI) briefed its recent Acquisition Requirements Reform study. AFRI examined the greater acquisition and requirements processes and proposed Air Force acquisition requirements reform strategies that instill further discipline and expedite the requirements process to satisfy warfighter needs.

5. The Research Subcommittee continues to be strong advocates for the research conducted at Air University.

C. Institutional Advancement Meeting Summary.

1. Branding Discussion. Dr. Cam Martindale, Senior Vice President for Community Development, Montgomery Area Chamber of Commerce, and Ms. Sandi Gouge, President and CEO of Gouge Marketing Group, discussed efforts, commitments, and lessons learned for branding as it related to Troy University's process of transforming from three independently accredited institutions into one university.

2. Role of BOV. The subcommittee discussed their role for advocacy for Air University and added this function to the Bylaws for consideration.

3. Review of AU Mission Statement. The subcommittee provided Gen Fadok several suggestions for the proposed Mission statement and later presented the revised Mission statement to the full Board for approval.

4. Review of 2012 Honorary Degree Nominations. The subcommittee reviewed the 2012 Honorary Degree nominations and provided the Board with their recommendations for selection of the 2012 Honorary Degree recipient. The Board also discussed alternative means to recognize individuals or groups where an academic recognition might not be appropriate. The Board would like to commend the AU Foundation for volunteering to establish and fund a "Presidential Medal" program that would be presented on behalf or by the Air University Commander and President.

5. National Security Forum – The Board is available to assist with nominations for attendance to future forums.