

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

5 November 2012 / 0800 – 1700

6 November 2012 / 0800 – 1130

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 reached 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.



NORMAN R. AUGUSTINE  
Chair, AU Board of Visitors  
March 12, 2013

- 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: Public Comments - Presentation by Mr. Kedar Phadke

## Section I: Board Attendance

### A. Board Members attending the meeting:

1. Mr. Norman Augustine
2. Col Robert Beasley, USAF, Ret
3. Rev William Beauchamp
4. Mrs. Mary Boies
5. Gen Charles Boyd, USAF, Ret
6. Maj Gen Stephen Condon, USAF, Ret
7. Ambassador Gary Cooper, MajGen, USMC, Ret
8. Dr. Ding-Jo Currie
9. Mr. Henry Fong
10. Dr. Stephen Fritz
11. Dr. Mildred Garcia
12. Dr. Rufus Glasper
13. Dr. Jack Hawkins
14. Dr. Muriel Howard
15. Dr. Joe Lee
16. CMSgt Karl Meyers, USAF, Ret
17. Dr. Ann Millner
18. Vice Adm Daniel Oliver, USN, Ret
19. Maj Gen Richard Paul, USAF, Ret
20. Maj Gen Ron Sega, USAF, Ret
21. Mr. Fletcher Wiley

### B. Members of the AU BOV absent:

1. Dr. Terry Alfriend
2. Adm Vern Clark, USN, Ret
3. Gen Patrick Gamble, USAF, Ret
4. Dr. Benjamin Lambeth
5. CMSAF Gerald Murray, USAF, Ret
6. Brig Gen Clifton Poole, USA, Ret
7. Dr. Eugene Spafford

### 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 Scott Hanson, Spaatz Center/CC
4. Brig Gen Stephen Denker, ACSC/CC
5. Brig Gen Roger Watkins, Holm Center/CC
6. Dr. Bruce Murphy, AU/CF
7. Dr. Todd Stewart, AFIT/CL
8. Col David Cohen, AU/DS
9. Col Terrance McCaffrey, SOC/CC
10. Col John McCain, Eaker Center/CC
11. Col Stewart Price, Barnes Center/CC
12. Col Susan Schlacter, 42 ABW/CV
13. CMSgt Lonnie Slater, AU/CCC
14. Dr. Chris Cain, AFRI
15. Mr. John Carter, Spaatz Center
16. Dr. Mark Conversino, Spaatz Center
17. Mr. Harry Foster, Spaatz Center
18. Dr. Steve Hansen, AU/CFA
19. Mr. John Kongable, AU/JA
20. Dr. Richard Lester, Eaker Center
21. Dr. Jeff Luzius, AU/AUL
22. Mr. Stan Norris, Spaatz Center
23. Dr. Glen Spivey, Spaatz Center
24. Dr. Marlin Thomas, AFIT
25. Mr. Lloyd Wilson, AU/CFR
26. Mrs. Diana Bunch, Designated Federal Officer
27. Dr. Shawn O'Mailia, Alternate DFO
28. Mr. Kedar Phadke

## **Section II: Board Activities and Discussions**

A. The Air University (AU) Board of Visitors (BOV) meeting convened at 0800 hours on 5 November 2012 in the AU Headquarters' Conference Room at Maxwell Air Force Base, AL. Mr. Norman Augustine chaired the meeting. Mr. Augustine informed the Board members that this formal meeting was open to the public and was advertised in the Federal Register on 25 May 2012 (Vol.77, No. 102). Mrs. Diana Bunch, Designated Federal Officer for the Board, was present during the meeting and a quorum was met.

B. Opening Comments: Mr. Augustine opened the meeting and extended his appreciation to the members for their commitment to participate in the board meetings.

C. Annual Outbrief to the Secretary of the Air Force: Mr. Augustine summarized the annual outbrief meeting that was held with the Secretary of the Air Force (SECAF) and the Chief of Staff (CSAF) on 6 September 2012 and stated the ad hoc committee outcomes, Learning Air Force, and the College for Leadership Development were among the topics discussed during this meeting. He stated these topics were of great interest to both the SECAF and the CSAF. Mr. Augustine also informed the board that the SECAF awarded Dr. Jack Hawkins with the Distinguished Public Service Award for his service not only as his role on the board but also to his country.

D. AU Commander and President's Discussion: Lt Gen David Fadok opened his discussion by thanking the Board for their support of the Honorary Degree Program and their attendance in the ceremony on Monday morning honoring Mr. Ike Skelton.

Gen Fadok provided an overview of the university's three focus areas which includes education, research, and outreach. He also addressed the 2012 successes and proposed goals for 2013. Gen Fadok outlined the progress towards the Learning Air Force, to include updates on the proposed future construct of officer professional military education (OPME) and enlisted professional military education (EPME). Highlights included discussion on spreading distance learning (DL) modules throughout an Airman's career, rather than keeping them specific to a PME course. These modules would graduate from general to specific and parallel each other within the OPME and EPME courses. They would involve foundational and pre-requisite modules that could supplement current training and utilize existing programs. Gen Fadok ended his discussions with a summary of topics discussed at the recent Command Board of Advisors (CBOA) meeting.

E. Working Lunch: Dr. Dale Hayden provided a preview of the Asia-Pacific briefing during lunch.

F. Vice President for Academic Affairs Discussion: Dr. Bruce Murphy and Dr. Chris Cain discussed the revision of the AU Strategic Plan, the latest activities of the Academic Corporate Process, and the university's progress in preparing for the Fifth Year Interim Review that will be conducted by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Commission on Colleges in 2015.

G. Board Membership Changes: Mr. Augustine informed the board of the required changes in membership directed from the Secretary of Defense's office. These changes include reducing

the membership to no more than 20 members on the committee, no more than 15 members on subcommittees, and no more than 5 subcommittees.

H. Center Visits: The Board visited the Eaker Center and the Holm Center on Tuesday morning to learn more about the latest developments for each of these centers. The Board was provided an opportunity to speak with several members of each center and to tour the facilities.

I. The Board's requests, observations, and recommendations were presented to Gen Fadok on Tuesday, 6 November 2012, and are included in Sections IV of these minutes.

J. Mr. Augustine welcomed any comments from the public. Mr. Kedar M. Phadke requested to make a presentation to the Board regarding information presented to the AFIT Subcommittee of the AU Board of Visitors during their meeting in May 2012. Presentation transcript located in Section VI of these minutes.

K. The meeting was adjourned at 11:30 a.m. on Tuesday, 6 November 2012.

### **Section III: Board Actions**

A. **April 2012 BOV Meeting Minutes.** The Board approved the April 2012 Meeting Minutes on 10 May 2012.

B. **Future Meeting Dates.** The Board approved the next meeting date of 8-9 April 2013 to be held at Air University, Maxwell AFB, AL.

C. **Review of Mission Statement, Fiscal Stability, Institutional Policies, and Foundations.** There were no actions taken regarding the university's mission statement, fiscal stability, institutional policies, or foundations.

D. **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.

E. **Board Membership Changes.** The Board reviewed the new membership requirements directed from the Secretary of Defense and agreed to the changes for the membership of the Academic Affairs and AFIT Subcommittee. The committee is limited to no more than \*15 members and no more than 5 subcommittees. In addition, subcommittees are limited to no more than 15 members for each subcommittee. Subcommittee members are no longer required to attend the subcommittee meetings. The Bylaws will be updated and sent to the members for review and implementation.

\*Update: Further SECAF-directed reduction in membership from 20 to 15 since the November meeting.

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

G. **Ad Hoc Committee Follow Up.** The Board approved Maj Gen (ret) Pat Condon's suggestion that General (ret) Pat Gamble and Mr. Augustine discuss the outcomes of the Ad Hoc Committee's work with the new AF Chief of Staff.

H. **Closed Meeting.** The Board requested to close a portion of the April 2031 meeting to allow the board members to discuss their evaluation of the AU Commander and President (as required by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools and the BOV Bylaws).

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 the BOV Bylaws).

## Section IV: Board Requests, Observations, and Recommendations

(Numbering Key: MM/YYYY/##)

### A. Agenda Requests:

**Request 11-2012-12:** The Board would like to devote the next meeting to the theme of “Lessons Learned in Making Change.” The Board will share their experiences and lessons learned with AU leadership regarding funding restrictions and personnel reductions.

### B. Observations:

**Observation 11-2012-01:** The more AU gets away from the requirements of accreditation, the risk of losing accreditation increases.

**Observation 11-2012-02:** The Board points out there is more than one path through the education system—a path for the most outstanding, promising leaders; a mandatory path for distance learning; and a volunteer path for self development.

### C. Recommendations:

**Recommendation 11-2012-13:** Recommend AU review the AF ROTC scholarship offerings to align with future AF needs and to compare and contrast with competitive offerings that our very best young men and women have available.

**Recommendation 11-2012-14:** Recommend AU consider the merits of moving from multiple learning management systems to a single or no more than two systems. This change will reduce redundancy and costs.

**Recommendation 11-2012-15:** Current restrictions on conference/symposium participation place an unrealistic and potentially destructive limitation on faculty development and effectiveness. Peer networking, paper presentation, and recognition are essential to faculty progression in their respective fields, and restrictions can greatly inhibit quality faculty recruitment and retention. Recommend responsibility and authority be given to the AU Commander and President, with delegation authority, to approve conference/symposium participation by AU faculty members.

**Recommendation 11-2012-16:** The Board strongly supports the blended learning approach and recommended AU continue developments in the blended learning environment and also recommended AU pursue more state-of-the-art technology to support blended learning.

**Recommendation 11-2012-17:** Recommend AU continue strategic overview type of studies such as the US Air Force Strategy Study for Asian-Pacific.

**Recommendation 11-2012-18:** Duplication and redundancy continues among the schools and centers in areas such as institutional research, registrar services, technology, etc. There still doesn't seem to be a registrar function that can yield the information regarding the number of students to the commander at any given point in time. The Board believes strong academic leadership is the central point. This issue has been recommended several times over the past several years. The Board is encouraged by some of the recent discussions regarding the Learning Air Force and the centralization of activities; however, the Board remains concerned by the present duplication.

**Recommendation 11-2012-19:** With regards to the presentation by Mr. Kedar Phadke of Phadke Associates, the Board recommends AU review current policies and practices to ensure software reviews are conducted in accordance with regulatory guidance.

## **Section V: Status on Previous Meeting Requests, Observations, And Recommendations as of 5 November 2012**

*(Numbering Key: MM/YYYY/##)*

### **A. Agenda Requests:**

**Request 07-2012-08:** The Higher Learning Commission (HLC) identified four recommendations to be addressed by AFIT. AFIT is to report the actions taken to the HLC by December 2012. Request a summary of the report of HLC recommendations to the AFIT Subcommittee at the time of submission to the HLC.

**AU Response:** Concur. AFIT will provide the AFIT Subcommittee with a copy of its report to the Higher Learning Commission, when it is submitted in December 2012.

**Recommended Action: OPEN.**

**Request 07-2012-09:** The AFIT subcommittee reviewed the current status of the SECNAV/SECAF MOA and associated memorandum of understanding (MOU) and understand AFIT and NPS leadership are reviewing both documents for possible changes. Request AFIT provide a status update of the SECNAV/SECAF MOA and MOU during the next scheduled AFIT subcommittee meeting.

**AU Response:** Concur. The AFIT and NPS leadership are tentatively scheduled to meet in late November 2012, to review the MOA and MOU, as well as to discuss a number of other topics. AFIT will provide a summary of that meeting to the AFIT Subcommittee.

**Recommended Action: OPEN.**

**Request 07-2012-10:** There appears to exist a mismatch between AFIT's education capacity, available external research funding and student availability. For example, the ability of AFIT to receive payment for classes delivered is restricted in certain cases. Request AFIT provide the subcommittee information on the requirements, regulations and policy environment that is enabling or restricting the efficient delivery of advanced degreed graduates in-residence and through distance learning.

**AU Response:** Concur. AFIT will provide the requested information to the AFIT Subcommittee at its next meeting; however, the following points are provided as an update:

- The Air Force's requirements for graduate education in various academic specialties and PCE courses are, in general, determined by Air Force policy, by its various functional communities (e.g., Acquisition, Civil Engineering, Logistics, Contracting, etc.) and by various major commands. However, available resources have historically not allowed all of these requirements to be satisfied. The Air Force Education Requirements Board (AFERB) meets annually, to determine funded quotas for various graduate and PCE programs, including the number of students funded to attend various AFIT programs in residence. The AFERB also determines the number of students who will be educated at the PhD level, for a follow-on assignment to AFIT's graduate faculty. Currently, less than 50% of AFIT's requirement for "faculty pipeline students" is projected for funding.
- In general, AFIT's capacity to deliver its various graduate and professional continuing education (PCE) programs is determined by its available resources, i.e.,



- authorities, military and civilian faculty and staff manpower, facilities, and (appropriated and non-appropriated) funding for necessary support activities.
- Requirements for, and staffing of, military faculty and staff positions are a function of Air Force policy, demands to support deployment and other operational requirements, etc.
  - Available civilian faculty and staff manpower have frequently been the target of manpower-reduction exercises, without regard to current and projected teaching and research workloads.
  - AFIT's ability to attract and accomplish sponsored research (i.e., funding from external sources) is a function of the size of its graduate faculty and the number of available graduate students (masters and PhD).
  - Currently, tuition for international students goes to SAF/IA (International Affairs); it does not remain with AFIT. Similarly, tuition for eligible students who would attend AFIT using (e.g.) their GI Bill, goes to the US Treasury.
  - AFIT facilities must be programmed through the Military Construction (MILCON) process. This is a separate federal appropriation, which is independent of other appropriations that fund AFIT activities.
  - Bottom line: Currently, Air Force policy and procedures for determining graduate and PCE educational requirements, allocating funded quotas to AFIT (vice NPS and civilian institutions), manpower and staffing reduction exercises, tuition funding/retention policies, facility construction, etc., are not well harmonized, resulting in the noted "mismatch" and imbalances.

**Recommended Action: OPEN.**

**Request 07-2012-11:** Request an update on the status of the AFIT AFERB recommendations at the November 2012 meeting.

**AU Response:** Concur. A Background Paper will be included in the meeting materials for the November AU BOV meeting. **Recommended Action: OPEN.**

**Request 04-2012-01:** The Board requested interim updates when significant events (good or bad) occur in between board meeting. Information should be concise, brief, board-level interest items and could be sent via e-mail format.

**AU Response:** Concur. AU will continue to send the board members updates regarding university activities. **Recommended Action: CLOSED.**

**Request 04-2012-02:** Suggest the Strategic Imperatives be briefed to wider audiences such as faculty and students for further discussion and prioritization. AU might consider using tools such as Delphi in the prioritization process. The BOV requested an update at the November 2012 meeting.

**AU Response:** Concur. The Academic Affairs Office (CFA) has conducted a series of meetings, including the initial meeting of the AU Academic Corporate Working Group, to discuss the revision of the strategic plan. Representatives from all Centers and Schools were involved. AU/CFA has circulated copies of the draft goals and objectives derived from the

Strategic Imperatives to Center representatives for comment and input. Additionally, AU/CFA held a meeting on 8 August with Center representatives to describe the development of the strategic objectives and measures and to solicit Center feedback. An update will be provided during the November board meeting. **Recommended Action: CLOSED.**

**Request 04-2012-03:** Requested an update regarding the move to .edu during the next BOV meeting in November 2012.

**AU Response:** Reference Recommendation 11-2010-28 of this document. **Recommended Action: CLOSED.**

**Request 04-2012-04:** Requested an update regarding SOS Blending Learning initiative.

**AU Response:** Reference Recommendation 11-2011-20 of this document. **Recommended Action: CLOSED.**

**Request 04-2012-05:** Requested BOV be briefed on the Fifth Year Review efforts at each meeting.

**AU Response:** Concur. The Vice President for Academic Affairs will provide an update regarding the SACS Fifth-Year Interim Report during each of the upcoming meeting. **Recommended Action: CLOSED.**

**Request 04-2012-06:** The BOV appreciated that the briefing Maj Gen Andersen provided was the beginning of creating a "learning Air Force" strategy for the future. It is conceptual and preliminary and raised many questions for the Board members. The BOV requested a follow up meeting (conference call) during the next 60 to 90 days to discuss the Tiger Team's developments.

**AU Response:** Concur. Air University provided an update regarding the Learning Air Force on 24 July 2012. **Recommended Action: CLOSED.**

**B. Observations: None.**

**C. Recommendations:**

**Recommendation 07-2012-07:** This proposal is in line with the BOV's discussion with the Secretary of the Air Force in January 2012 that outlined directions for Air Force education.

The BOV supports the concept of the development of the College of Leadership Development (CLD) and encourages the President of Air University to develop the concept of operations required to implement the CLD. Further, the President of AU is encouraged to present the concept and the CONOPS to General Rice. With the concurrence of General Rice, the Chair of the BOV will present the concept to the Secretary of the Air Force.

**AU Response:** Concur. The progress of the Learning Air Force will be discussed in detailed during the November AU BOV meeting. **Recommended Action: OPEN.**

**Recommendation 07-2012-08:** Recommend the concept of operations include a focus on consolidation of like functions such as IT and other support functions, which will eliminate duplication and maximize efficiency and effectiveness of resources.

**AU Response:** Concur. The progress of the Learning Air Force will be discussed in detailed during the November AU BOV meeting. **Recommended Action: OPEN.**

**Recommendation 07-2012-09:** Some specific resource reduction allocation decisions affecting AFIT have been made from outside of the organization. This has the potential of suboptimization and unnecessarily impacting the ability of AFIT to execute its mission. In some cases, decisions that make perfectly good sense for many organizations are harmful to organizations, such as AFIT, that do not fit the conventional mold. To the maximum extent practical, recommend AFIT be allowed to determine how best to allocate manpower and other resource reductions levied upon it. In cases where entire programs are proposed for elimination, allow AFIT to provide an impact assessment before a final decision is made.

**AU Response:** Concur. Where feasible, direct authority over manpower and resources are delegated to the center commanders. **Recommended Action: CLOSED.**

**Recommendation 07-2012-10:** The downward directed mandate to reduce support personnel has resulted in severe cuts to administrative support for the faculty. Some departments have no administrative support. This means the faculty must perform these duties. The result is the faculty either have to work more hours to perform the same job or be less efficient in their primary duties of teaching and research. Even though this may be a viable short term solution, the long term effects, in addition to the reduced efficiency, could create problems in faculty retention and faculty recruitment, both of which affect the quality of AFIT. Recommend AFIT a) assess the long term impact of this policy, and b) investigate other approaches to resolving this problem, even if it means not filling faculty positions.

**AU Response:** An update will be provided during the next AFIT Subcommittee meeting. **Recommended Action: OPEN.**

**Recommendation 07-2012-11:** During the AFIT Subcommittee's sessions with the students and faculty, there was strong and consistent feedback regarding inadequacy of the IT system. Complaints were wide-ranging, and included long wait times to fix computers, poor cell reception, inadequate bandwidth to support video streaming, un-renewed and lost software licenses, and onerous firewalls and security measures that made unclassified educational research difficult. It was also reported that the .edu domain at AFIT was overly restrictive because .mil domain policies had been applied to the .edu domain. As a result, many students reported they were forced to operate from home using their personal computers and internet connectivity to accomplish much of their day-to-day tasks and course-related research. Recommend AFIT establish a task force to catalog the full set of IT problems, determine the level at which each problem could be addressed (e.g., locally at AFIT, base level, AU level, command level, etc.), and then develop an action plan to address local problems and forward the others to higher levels as appropriate for action.

**AU Response:** Concur. AFIT has established a “corporate infrastructure board” that includes the leadership of each of AFIT’s schools and its support directorates. This board will corporately manage both IT and facility planning and programming. This includes:

- Identifying, validating and prioritizing requirements;
- Assessing current policies and procedures, to identify specific problems, issues and opportunities for improvement;
- Benchmarking AFIT’s IT capabilities, resources, policies, processes and procedures against those at other DoD academic institutions;
- Developing strategies and plans to address IT and facility requirements in the most cost-effective manner;
- Programming and budgeting all of the resources necessary to implement and sustain effective, reliable and affordable IT and facilities support, including (e.g.) authorities, manpower, and funding for (e.g.) pay, equipment, contracted services, etc.

The AFIT Strategic Plan will include a separate appendix for IT and for facilities. These two appendices will detail specific goals and objectives, as well as related schedules and resource requirements. **Recommended Action: CLOSED.**

**Recommendation 07-2012-12:** The number of coded billets requiring advanced degrees in some key strategic areas for the Air Force appears to be very limited. For example, in the area of cyberspace, the number of individuals slotted for attending advanced degree programs is very small for FY13. The AFIT subcommittee is aware that AU is addressing recommendations that came out of the AFERB AFSO21 event in February 2012. Recommend a personnel system that manages critical skills and advanced degree needs in these fields more in an “inventory” based construct rather than the current “billet-only” based construct.

**AU Response:** Concur. This topic was discussed during the AU BOV outbrief with the SECAF. **Recommended Action: OPEN.**

**Recommendation 04-2012-01:** Air University confirm through the general counsel whether there is still a congressional mandate that the services provide a commission means for enlisted personnel. If that requirement still exists, request AU provide the BOV a description of how the AF will meet the spirit, intent, and letter of that requirement without the Airmen Education Commissioning Program (AECP).

**AU Response:** Concur. There is no current statute that requires the AF have the Airmen Education Commissioning Program (AECP) or any specific program for enlisted personnel to procure a commission. There are a number of opportunities (other than AECP) for enlisted member to secure an AF commission. There are three remaining programs for which enlisted members who do not have their degree may apply; the Airman Scholarship and Commissioning Program (ASCP), the Professional Officer Course- Early Release Program (POC-ERP), and the Scholarships for Outstanding Airmen to ROTC (SOAR) program. In each of these programs, an enlisted member separates from active duty, enrolls as a full-time college student and participates in the ROTC program, through which he/she earns a commission. The programs differ in terms of how much college credit one must have prior to applying and whether or not the program provides funds for tuition and/or fees. There are specialized programs that assist with education in specific fields, such as the Nurse Enlisted Commissioning Program (NECP). Additionally, enlisted members who have a four-

year degree may apply to OTS. There is also a program, Leaders Encouraging Airmen Development (LEAD), through which enlisted members may apply to attend the AF Academy or the AF Academy Preparatory School. **Recommended Action: CLOSED.**

**Recommendation 04-2012-02:** The Board recommended candidacy status for the National Guard Cyber Training Center.

**AU Response:** Concur. Air University notified the National Guard Cyber Training Center of their candidacy approval. **Recommended Action: CLOSED.**

**Recommendation 04-2012-03:** The Board recommended candidacy status for the Medical Education and Training Campus.

**AU Response:** Concur. Air University notified the medical Education and Training Center of their candidacy approval. **Recommended Action: CLOSED.**

**Recommendation 04-2012-04:** The Board recommended approval of CCAF Academic Policy 6.14.0. Admitted and registered students who have been separated, retired or commissioned shall be withdrawn. Retired or separated members who at the time of separation from active duty are categorized by the Service Secretary concerned as seriously wounded, ill, or injured as that term is defined in the Wounded Warrior Act are authorized to participate in CCAF programs up to 10 years after separation or retirement. This provision applies to members so categorized after 11 September 2001; for those separated between 12 September 2001 and 30 December 2011, the 10-Year commencement date shall be 30 December 2011.

**AU Response:** Concur. The CCAF Academic Policy 6.14.0. has been implemented.  
**Recommended Action: CLOSED.**

**Recommendation 04-2012-05:** Given the financial environment, AU should point out the risks being taken as they respond to decision makers and that AU stress the long-term benefits of education as an investment in the future leadership of the Air Force.

**AU Response:** Concur. Air University will continue to include information regarding the long-term benefits of education in communication with senior AF leadership.  
**Recommended Action: CLOSED.**

**Recommendation 04-2012-06:** AU has done a great job of addressing the recommendations that came from the study by Dr. James Fisher in 2007 and the BOV suggests the AU commander and president integrate this study into the overall development of AU. The BOV recommends the four major principles as a result of this study:

- 1) Continue to look at the university culture;
- 2) Continue to focus on elimination of duplication;
- 3) Continue to look at branding of AU; and
- 4) Research the alumni association and foundation issues as they relate to the university. The alumni association would be very different from a traditional university alumni association and also to think about the role of the foundation, as it has begun to show strength in terms of the work they've been able to do.

**AU Response:** Concur. The Air University Commander and President has emphasized the importance of maintaining a unified university culture. His Commander's Perspective describes this as "all oars pulling hard and pulling together;" his public mantra is that AU is a single team. As the AU Strategic Plan is revised and implemented, the Academic Affairs Office has introduced objectives designed to strengthen the university's culture. To assist in this effort, the university has a goal, with associated objectives, to build partnerships and external advocacy to promote the Air University mission. This will help assure strong governance and sponsorship for AU programs through the Board of Visitors, Command Board of Advisors, and through the Air Force's corporate force development processes.

A second priority is to attract and develop an outstanding faculty and staff through faculty development, assessment, and sharing expertise and insights across the university. Objectives and measures that aim to improve faculty and staff competencies through development opportunities, collaboration, and information exchange should strengthen the bonds among the various centers and schools. Emphasizing the contributions that each program makes to the overall credibility and accreditation of the university will help create and strengthen the university's identity as the leadership and intellectual center of the Air Force.

**Recommended Action: OPEN.**

**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.

**AU Response:** Recommendation presented to SECAF on 20 January 2012 for consideration.

**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.

**AU Response:** Recommendation presented to SECAF on 20 January 2012 for consideration.

**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.

**AU Response:** Recommendation presented to SECAF on 20 January 2012 for consideration. Additionally, HQ AF showed strong support of STEM positions in the FY13 education requirement board with 88 percent of the requirements being filled.

**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.

**AU Response:** Recommendation presented to SECAF on 20 January 2012 for consideration.

**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.

**AU Response:** Concur. The Academic Affairs Office has remained engaged in the discussions regarding technological requirements for learning content and learning support. In a series of meetings with HQ AETC, AU representatives have provided input for learning management system requirements to inform AETC's pursuit of a comprehensive learning management technical solution. AETC continues to identify LMS requirements and has kept AU informed of developments. **Recommended Action: CLOSED.**

**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.

**AU Response:** Concur. The results of the SOS Blended Learning feasibility study pointed to some significant challenges that may occur during a conversion to a program with a significant blended learning component. The Academic Affairs Office (CFA) has consulted with the Squadron Officer College to help design a follow-on test that will be more comprehensive and rigorous in testing the blending learning concept. This follow-on test will include measures of program effectiveness, assessment of learning outcomes, and student satisfaction. During the planning sessions, AU/CFA staff and SOC personnel identified significant challenges in terms of selecting a student population that would provide both an unbiased, rigorous, and fair evaluation of the blended learning approach. Additionally, provided AU concludes that moving toward a blended learning program, Air Force policies would have to accommodate time and other resources to allow students to keep pace with the SOC program at a distance while also entering any resident PME experience on a level playing field. The team has concluded that November 2012 would present the earliest opportunity to conduct the study complexity of the variables involved. **Recommended Action: OPEN.**

**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.

**AU Response:** Concur. The Medical Education and Training Center (METC) was approved for candidacy status during the April 2012 meeting. **Recommended Action: CLOSED.**

**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.

**AU Response:** In addition to complying with comprehensive Air Force instructions addressing software procurement, accreditation, and operational use, AU has instituted several formal processes to assess risks associated with the licensing and/or operation of third-party products that are on critical paths for AU missions. For example, AU schools submit their information/educational technology requirements via an electronic Communication System Requirements Document (CSRD) where in turn, the 42d Communications Squadron reviews via the established Work Order Management System and provides a technical solution based on industry/military best practices as well as Air Force approved products. Subsequently, AU evaluates the requirement and technical solution against current guidance to include sustainment to ensure viability to employ and support as well as integration with current/future environments. Additionally, all requirements that impact AU systems (ranging from software modifications of current systems to third-party/commercial-off-the-shelf add-ons) are processed by the Configuration Control Board. As another layer of risk management, AU instituted a corporate process where the first level of review is performed by the Information Technology Working Group. Chaired by the A4/6 director, the role of the working group is to review all CSRD submissions in a roundtable format to examine and assess known and unknown enterprise/system impacts as well as costs and benefits to AU. The provisions put into place at AU have a solid track record of establishing corporate risk assessment and management processes of information/educational technology third-party licensed products as proven by the decision to abandon further use of OutStart Learning Content Management System. However, as with the ever evolving technology and organization changes, AU will continue to remain vigilant and flexible to define and refine processes in concert with Air Force guidance to prevent negative AU mission impacts in a cost conscious environment. **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.

**AU Response:** Concur. Since 2002, the Center for Cyberspace Research (CCR), located within AFIT/ENG, has utilized a Distinguished Review Board (DRB) to guide and validate the relevancy of the cybersecurity education and research programs at AFIT. In 2008, the Secretary of the Air Force designated AFIT and the CCR as the Air Force Cyberspace Technical Center of Excellence (AF CyTCoE). At the same time, an Air Force Cyberspace Education Board of Advisors (BOA) was established by Headquarters Air Force (HAF) to oversee and guide the progress of cybersecurity education within the Air Force. These two boards meet on a semi-annual basis, to discuss current and emerging cyber security issues, as well as to review the progress of AFIT cybersecurity initiatives.

In 2008, to fill a void in the development of the Air Force cybersecurity workforce development, HAF tasked AFIT to create two continuing education short courses (Cyber 200 and Cyber 300). These courses are taught by instructors who possess current operational experience and are synergistically melded with the Graduate School of Engineering and Management's cyber security research programs enabling current graduate research results to be rolled into the Cyber 200 and Cyber 300 curricula. U.S. Cyber Command approved joint certification for the Cyber 200 and Cyber 300 courses in 2011. Since October 2010, over 1100 officers, enlisted, and civilians from across the Federal Government have been educated via Cyber 200 and 300. The current annual throughput for these classes is 600 students with U.S. Cyber Command wanting to increase the numbers to close to 800 per year.



In 2011, the AU proposed to establish a “Cyber Air Corp Tactical School” (recommended name change to Air Force Cybersecurity Institute). This effort was initiated to stimulate innovative, strategic thinking and research about cybersecurity to and grow and harmonize cybersecurity education across AU and the AF, including the current cyber programs at AFIT; the AF Research Institute; and the Spaatz, LeMay, and Holm Centers. Four AFIT/ENG faculty participated in drafting the Chief Scientist’s CyberVision 2025 report that was released in August 2012. A significant portion of this report concerned cyber education and training within the Air Force.

Both the graduate and continuing education curricula are continually updated as appropriate by the AFIT/ENG subject matter experts, based on the changing needs of the Air Force and the DoD. To ensure currency, relevance, and to minimize duplication of effort across the DoD, AFIT/ENG graduate faculty and continuing education instructors participate in various working groups to support the National Initiative for Cybersecurity Education . On-going efforts have included participation in DoD cybersecurity education workshops in February and June 2012.

The CCR and AF CyTCoE also collaborate with other DoD and national partners, to develop research solutions which not only solve a pressing operational need, but also provide avenues for advancing cybersecurity education, at the graduate, professional military education, and professional continuing education levels. The DoD partners include the National Defense University, Naval Postgraduate School, all three service academies, and the service war colleges.

In summary, AFIT continues to stay plugged-in and abreast of changing cybersecurity educational and research initiatives across the Air Force and DoD. These changes are then incorporated into Air University’s graduate-degree/certificate and continuing education programs, and into its research and consulting/advising initiatives. **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's current infrastructure limits the ability to advance the Air Force's intellectual capital through timely and robust education. Limits, in the form security controls and technical mandates, drive greater costs while reducing (or eliminating) potential advancement of the educational mission. Future AF learning initiatives will demand a technology platform outside the AFNET to support curriculum delivery requirements, distance learning, and blended learning methodologies.

As AU transforms education delivery, it is essential to have a flexible technology platform to quickly adapt to the needs of students and faculty. Such a flexible platform will provide a properly controlled infrastructure necessary to quickly assess and, when appropriate, implement AU Board of Visitors recommendations and comply with Southern Association of Colleges and Schools accreditation standards. A less restrictive network will provide an

agile infrastructure to quickly assess the benefits of new technologies and education methodologies, allowing for seamless incorporation of time-sensitive content into the learning experience.

AU's vision is to provide a flexible technology platform to students and faculty, allowing for unrestricted education access. However, due to risks to personally identifiable information, student information systems will remain behind the security firewall on the military network.

Currently, AU A3/6 is building a proposal for decision that will compare solutions, benefits, and costs for commercial network capabilities. A decision brief will be presented to the AU Commander/President in January 2013. **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.

**AU Response:** Concur. CDSAR R&R Phase II (COBOL/C to Java) was successfully completed on 22 Aug 2011 and the Oracle 8i to 10G was successfully completed on 8 Oct 2011. Both updates were without incident. CDSAR currently in maintenance mode with 6 successful maintenance releases this FY and one in-progress. All FY12 maintenance is currently performed by organic resources. The R&R program objectives to achieve legacy system migration to a stable platform have been completed. The focus area of modularity will be incorporated into future maintenance production requirements as prioritized by the Configuration Control Committee. We will seek no further funding for contracted efforts. We've returned to standard maintenance cycle production by organic resources as we close the last chapter on CDSAR R&R. **Recommended Action: CLOSED.**

**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. The goal of our Central Enrollment Registration (CER) is to simplify the enrollment, admission, and graduation processes for all courses and programs at Air University, thereby achieving effectiveness, creating efficiencies and maximizing the use of AU resources. CER is being built on the foundations from distance learning which was dynamically changed by Online Master's Degree (now called the Facilitated ACSC Distance Learning Program). CER is being developed and will operate using existing resources, generating savings across the Air University. **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, building 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 continues to experience 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 square feet, and is estimated to cost \$16.5M. The

project has been submitted to our Command Headquarters, Air Education and Training Command (AETC), as the 42d Air Base Wing's #1 Priority MILCON for several years. In April 2012, Air Force funds were provided to complete a conceptual (15%) design effort. In August 2012, a design team came to Maxwell and completed the conceptual design and validated the requirements (size and cost) for the needed facility. Our MILCON project must compete for funding against projects from the 18 other Wings in AETC, and competes well - ranking as high as #3 in the Command. However, in the current fiscal environment, funding through the normal MILCON process is still doubtful.

In hopes of receiving Congressional Insert consideration in the future, we advocate heavily for the new Fitness Center with our Congressional Delegates and Air Force Leadership whenever we get the opportunity. During each Congressional Staff Delegation visit we provide detailed information on the project and its condition, and take the distinguished visitor on a tour of the facility if their time allows. We will continue to advocate hard for the MILCON project at every opportunity.

In the interim, we have completed projects in the existing fitness center to repair/refurbish the heating ventilation and air-conditioning, upgrade the finishes, and replace the flooring. Additionally, when the new Gunter commissary is complete in Fiscal Year 2014, we plan to convert a portion of the old Gunter commissary to a Fitness Center Annex to house additional fitness equipment and support additional physical activities. This will allow expansion of the physical training space in the interim as we wait for future funding for the new fitness facility. **Recommended Action: CLOSED.**

**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. AU has continued to expand the use of the AU distance learning program into a more robust enterprise. The use of the Blackboard LMS has expanded from the original then Online Master Degree Program, now labeled Facilitated ACSC Distance Learning Program to become the principle tool for content delivery within our enterprise. Its use is now the heart of AWC and ACSC PME offered via distance learning and is also used by the Eaker Center for professional continuing education courses. The key to its success was the integration of Blackboard into our distance learning student management system AUSIS. In this regard we pressed forward with moving the distance learning program for enlisted guard and reserves forces into AUSIS and have established their content as an offering for either a 'box of books' or online. Plans are to continue the expansion of AU DL programs for enlisted PME for the active duty force and grow the use for the senior enlisted workforce. Using the already established capability was briefed and well received by the AETC/CC during the month of July 2012. In addition plans are for the incorporating the SOS DL program into the AU distance learning enterprise by the end of 2012. All this is done via the robust AU Enterprise and the use of Service Oriented Architecture (SOA) and the use of service bus architecture. This architecture laid the foundation for AU to move forward with the means to gather upfront enrollment and registration data. The gathering of upfront data is

keen in our planning and has been under formal, corporate approved process since August 2010 to create the Central Enrollment Registration (CER) enterprise system platform for Air University. The goal of CER is to simplify the enrollment, admission, and graduation processes for all courses and programs at Air University, thereby achieving effectiveness, creating efficiencies and maximizing the use of AU resources. **Recommended Action: CLOSED.**

**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. Air University's Quality Enhancement Plan is a five year effort (2009-2014) that systematically enhances student learning and the supporting educational environment to develop cross-culturally competent Airmen. The Plan responds to both a Southern Association of Colleges and Schools requirement for reaffirmation of accreditation and U.S. Air Force calls to prepare Airmen for global engagements. SACS reviewed and approved the Plan in 2009. AU is implementing the Plan in three Phases: I. 2009-2011, initial schools; II. 2011-2013, remaining schools; III. 2013-2014, all elements in place. This past Academic Year (2011-2012) marked the start of Phase II, and the mid-point of Air University's execution of the Plan. **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. There are no changes to report at this time. **Recommended Action: MONITOR.**

## Section VI: Public Comments

*Note: The below document was provided by Mr. Kedar Phadke as a follow up from his presentation during the meeting.*

# PHADKE

Suite 200  
1 Shawnee Court  
Colts Neck, NJ 07722  
Phone: (732) 577-2878  
Fax: (732) 577-2879

November 7, 2012

Subject: Transcript of Presentation to AU Board of Visitors by Kedar Phadke PA-01  
([kedar@phadkeassociates.com](mailto:kedar@phadkeassociates.com))

Date: November 6, 2012

Notes: At Maxwell AFB, Alabama

It came to our attention that the AFIT Subcommittee meeting in March 2012 included comments about a software toolset that we manufacture “rdExpert™ Test Suite”. Specifically, the publicly distributed executive summary from the Air Force Center for Systems Engineering (CSE) stated as a strategic accomplishment, “Conducted an independent review of the Phadke rdExpert Tool Suite Toolset, at the request of the Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Air Force for Science, Technology and Engineering, concluding that the toolset does not fully satisfy AF needs”.

We were surprised because this seems like a very unusual topic for a public Board of Visitor’s meeting. We were also surprised because AFIT personnel had no access to the rdExpert Test Suite toolset, had no access to the proprietary technical underpinnings, and did not use the toolset on programs to assess cost, schedule, and risk benefits.

We are certain that AFIT personnel had no access to the toolset because our organization and our authorized resellers maintain strict records regarding licenses granted.

We request that AFIT clarify to the Board of Visitors, in the official meeting minutes, and in a report to Assistant Secretary of the Air Force for Acquisition that “The independent review was conducted without access to the rdExpert™ Test Suite toolset, without access to the toolset’s technical underpinnings, and without any use of the toolset on programs to assess benefits for cost, schedule, or risk reduction.”

Since AFIT had no access to the toolset or its technical underpinnings, the AFIT report (Dated June 6, 2011) made significant assumptions about the technical basis of the toolset, and they were incorrect. The actual technical foundations of the rdExpert Test Suite toolset are well accepted and can even be found clearly in Air Force briefings on the Director of Operational Test & Evaluation (DOT&E) website.

We would like AFIT to modify the report to include the following language prominently displayed: “The independent review was conducted without access to the rdExpert™ Test Suite toolset, without access to the toolset’s technical underpinnings, and without any use of the toolset on programs to assess benefits for cost, schedule, or risk reduction.” Additionally, we would like AFIT to commit to remove the inaccurate statements. We are available to assist in this process.

When Dr. Steven Walker, Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Air Force for Science, Technology and Engineering (SAF/AQRE), assigned the task of reviewing rdExpert Test Suite to AFIT, he requested an independent review. He was very clear in his request that he did not want AFIT to rely on the reviews that were conducted previously by Air Force organizations since he suspected a “not invented here” bias.

Rather than conducting the independent review, AFIT simply summarized prior reviews; the exact opposite of what Dr. Walker had requested. AFIT did not request access from the tool manufacturer for the review, or even request any other information from actual users of the toolset to form a basis for the independent review.

This review was incorrectly communicated to the Assistant Secretary of the Air Force for Acquisition as a true independent review. Dr. Walker and others in senior leadership were given the impression that AFIT actually had access to the software and had a basis for their conclusions. We have the email from Dr. Walker to that effect.

Regarding users of the toolset, there are several within the defense community. For example, Raytheon published an article in the 2011 issue of their Technology Today magazine about the enhancements the toolset delivered for test optimization. The benefits included a 30% reduction in test cost while maintaining or improving test effectiveness. Think about how much that could save the Air Force.

We wanted to bring these issues to the attention of the Board of Visitors to publicly request clarification for the inaccuracies of the AFIT report and the AFIT public announcement to the Board of Visitors earlier this year.

The Deputy Secretary of Defense Dr. Ashton Carter has charged both government and industry to “Do more with no more”. The rdExpert Test Suite toolset has been proven to do just that.

The Air Force has been investing millions of dollars over the past several years on statistical and design of experiments processes, tools, and personnel. With this background, we are wondering why AFIT has published the negative report as a strategic accomplishment. Is it because it was in AFIT’s strategic interest to publicly put down a potential competitor in order to preserve their current funding levels for statistical personnel and training?

It seems that way because AFIT included the review of the toolset in a list of key accomplishments for

2011. If anyone looked through the executive summary of the Board of Visitors meeting, this is the only mention of a product or service. The rest of the meeting agenda focused on AFIT

policy and strategic accomplishments. AFIT's strategic intent was further clarified by the apparent lack of interest in gaining access to a toolset they were tasked to evaluate.

It seems that AFIT found it in their best interest to use the public Board of Visitors forum to influence and dissuade others from using rdExpert Test Suite.

The rdExpert Test Suite toolset works. Actual users in the defense industry, like Raytheon, have proven the risk reduction, cost reduction, and schedule reduction benefits on several real programs.

At a time when we are all, whether in government, academia, or in the commercial world, looking for ways to reduce costs, wouldn't it be in AFIT's interest to honestly investigate alternative strategies that can potentially reduce cost, reduce training requirements, and most importantly, improve program effectiveness?

We request that the Board of Visitors investigate this issue, publish clarifications in the meeting minutes, publish a clarification to the Assistant Secretary of the Air Force for Acquisition, and rectify the situation promptly.

Thank you again for the opportunity to present.

rdExpert is a trademark of Phadke Associates, Inc.

© 2012 by Phadke Associates, Inc. All rights reserved.

**PHADKE**

[WWW.PHADKEASSOCIATES.COM](http://WWW.PHADKEASSOCIATES.COM)