



AUG 14 2018

MEMORANDUM FOR COMMANDANT, ARMY WAR COLLEGE

SUBJECT: Process for Accreditation of Joint Education (PAJE)

1. The U.S. Army War College Joint Studies Program (JSP) is conditionally accredited. The JSP is authorized to grant Joint Professional Military Education Phase II credit to graduates through 30 September 2021. The report of the PAJE team is enclosed. I approve the recommendations of that report.
2. I appreciate the hard work of the faculty and staff in presenting curricula that impart a joint perspective. Their efforts help ensure that we are developing agile and adaptive leaders with the requisite values and critical thinking skills necessary to keep pace with the changing strategic environment. This is especially noteworthy in that the JSP is using hybrid methods which may lead to an expansion of education opportunities.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "D. J. O'Donohue", is positioned above the typed name.

DANIEL J. O'DONOHUE
Lieutenant General, USMC
Director for Joint Force Development

Attachment:
As stated

Copy to:
CSA

CHAIRMAN
OF THE
JOINT CHIEFS OF STAFF



PROCESS
FOR
ACCREDITATION OF JOINT EDUCATION

U.S. ARMY WAR COLLEGE
JOINT STUDIES PROGRAM

Carlisle, PA
16-20 July 2018

REPORT OF ACCREDITATION OF THE
U.S. ARMY WAR COLLEGE
JOINT STUDIES PROGRAM

1. Introduction

a. A Chairman of the Joint chiefs of Staff (CJCS)-appointed Process for Accreditation of Joint Education (PAJE) team conducted an on-site assessment of the U.S. Army War College (USAWC) Joint Studies Program (JSP). The purpose of the review was to assess the degree to which the JSP curriculum implements CJCS policy for Phase II Joint Professional Military Education (JPME II), and to accredit the program for up to six years. The visit was conducted under the provisions of CJCSI 1800.01E, 29 May 2015 (Change 1), "Officer Professional Military Education Policy" (OPMEP).

b. In 2016, a Staff Assistance Visit team conducted a review of JSP and recommended the USAWC assess progress of JSP toward meeting OPMEP requirements as well as the challenges and obstacles to program expansion. For this accreditation visit, the PAJE team reviewed a self-study, which provided documentation from academic year (AY) 2018, associated curriculum, and related products. JSP names its academic year as the year of graduation. As a two-year course of instruction, students enroll in JSP for two full academic years.

c. The mission of USAWC states it "...educates and develops leaders for service at the strategic level while advancing knowledge in the global application of Landpower."

d. This report provides the findings of the PAJE team during its assessment of the JPME Phase II program. It provides general comments, observations and suggestions with respect to the standards and learning areas set forth in the OPMEP.

2. Recommendations

a. Conditional accreditation for 38 months effective 20 July 2018 through 30 September 2021. This aligns the date for JSP reaffirmation of accreditation with the USAWC Resident Education Program and Distance Education Program (JPME I) reaffirmation date, and allows USAWC time to ameliorate the compliance issues.

(1) This recommendation for accreditation is contingent on the JSP student body mix in AYs 2020 and forward being in compliance with Title

10 USC, Section 2155—JSP must have a proportionate mix of non-host military departments officer students.

(2) This recommendation is further contingent on USAWC adjusting the JSP First Year Studies to comply with Title 10 USC, Section 2155—JSP must have a joint faculty mix, joint faculty qualifications, and a joint student mix during the program’s entire two-year duration. This requirement must be in place at the start of JSP for AY 2021 (which begins in calendar year 2019).

b. Officers graduating JSP in AYs 2017/18/19 be granted JPME II credit.

c. USAWC inform the Joint Staff J-7 when the requirements identified in paragraphs (1) and (2) above are completed.

d. USAWC implement as appropriate, the suggestions identified in this report.

3. Evaluation

a. General Comments.

(1) Observations.

(a) Title 10 USC, Section 2155 requires Senior Service Colleges (JPME II) to have no more than 60 percent of military students from the host military department. The remaining 40 percent may include civilians, international officers, and officers from the other two military departments. Those non-host military students must be proportionally represented; i.e., Air Force and Sea Service students must be similar in number. The JSP Class of 2018 has a cumulative Army representation of 53.0%, but the other U.S. officers are 27.3% Sea Service (Marine Corps and Navy) and only 7.6% Air Force. While available Air Force officers are proportionately distributed across four seminars, overall this does not constitute proportionate military department representation. The current distribution does not meet the requirements of the law. Plans for AY 2019 and AY 2020 show an increasing disproportion between Sea Service and Air Force officers.

(b) The JSP (JPME II) is “nested in the Second Year Group Studies” and begins with the First Resident Course (FRC) that begins one year into the program. However, the self-study crosswalk tracks JPME II curriculum requirements across both the first and second year courses. The JSP is a two-year program but only during the second year does it satisfy the statutorily required JPME II joint student mix and joint faculty mix and qualification. The OPMEP requires that JPME II not be

delivered as a stand-alone course. Standards and Joint matters must be integrated into the full curriculum in combination with Service PME.

(c) The blended format of JSP is fundamentally sound and is a solid approach to achieving the higher-order cognitive and affective outcomes required for a JPME II program. The self-study lists the limitation of only two weeks of resident instruction per year as a weakness. It is not. USAWC has done an admirable job of leveraging instructional technology in a blended program to best serve the students and achieve the desired learning outcomes and should recognize this achievement as a strength.

(d) The opportunity for students to engage during the online periods is valuable. However, over those two years, there are approximately 122 days of online collaborative activity (Forums) 81 of which occur during the second year (JSP). By comparison, during the 40-week JPME II blended course at the Joint and Combined Warfighting School-Hybrid (JCWS-H) program there are approximately 150 days of threaded discussions and practical exercises during the online portions of its curriculum.

(e) The OPMEP requires programs undergoing a PAJE to provide a matrix that crosswalks each JPME learning area/objective to the course and lesson where it is addressed in the curriculum. The JSP self-study matrices map the Joint Learning Objectives (JLO) to the course level but do not provide useful linkages to the lower levels of the curriculum (block/unit/lesson). Additionally, there are repeated instances where the curriculum crosswalk matrices provided in the self-study do not reflect the contributions of the courses to the achievement of JLOs.

(f) There are discrepancies between multiple matrices and the course descriptions provided in the self-study. For example, DE2322 is recognized for supporting only 7 of 26 JLOs in the matrix but more in the course description. Additionally, as the culminating course of the curriculum, it should be recognized for its comprehensive contribution to either assessing or reinforcing learning outcomes across the curriculum.

(g) The self-study provided for PAJE team use contained some internal contradictions, vague references, and occasional use of Distance Education Program (DEP) information where JSP specific information was needed.

(2) Suggestions.

(a) Consider establishing the appropriate proportionate joint student mix for AY 2020 prior to FRC.

(b) Consider increasing the amount of online interaction required among the JSP students.

(c) Consider mapping Joint Learning Areas (JLA) and JLOs to the lowest level in the curriculum per the OPMEP requirement and improving the accuracy and clarity of curriculum mapping to courses, lessons, and student learning outcomes. This will help course directors, lesson developers, and faculty instructors verify and validate what is necessary to achieve and maintain outcomes and JLOs at the requisite level of learning.

b. Joint Standards. JSP partially meets OPMEP Standards One, Three, and Five and meets all other standards.

(1) Standard 1– Develop Joint Awareness, Perspective, and Attitudes. JPME curricula should prepare graduates to operate in a joint, interagency, intergovernmental, and multinational (JIIM) environment and bring a joint perspective to bear in their tactical, operational, strategic and critical thinking as well as professional actions. The missions of schools and colleges, as well as their goals, objectives, educational activities, and the mix of students and faculty should reflect joint educational requirements, encourage critical analyses of current and emerging national strategies from a joint perspective and foster a commitment to joint and interagency cooperation. The leadership, faculty, and students should manifest an appropriate commitment to jointness.

(a) Finding. JSP partially meets this standard.

(b) Observations.

1. USAWC's Strategic Plan, dated 1 December 2015, includes the mission, vision, intent, strategic framework, and lines of effort/objectives, however the program learning outcomes do not include joint educational requirements.

2. USAWC's enduring themes link courses, lessons, and topics together; these areas integrate JIIM into the curriculum.

3. Course syllabi refer to JLAs and JLOs to focus the content. There is evidence of incorporating the JIIM environment into the curriculum.

4. Seminar configurations are intentional to maximize diversity; students are sorted based on Service, military specialty, gender, etc. However, the military student mix is not appropriate for a JPME II program:

a. At the beginning of the first year, the full DEP student mix was 85% U.S. Army officers (374/440). This does not meet the requirement of no more than 60% from the host military department for a Senior Service College JPME II program.

b. At FRC, the full DEP class mix was 85% U.S. Army officers (318/374), which shows the change due to attrition. When breaking out JSP from the full DEP, the JSP class mix at FRC is 54% U.S. Army officers. This meets the requirement of no more than 60% from the host military department.

c. First year DEP seminar mix: for the 16 seminars, there were 18 total Sea Service students but only 5 Air Force students. This does not meet the requirement of at least one officer from each of the two non-host military departments per seminar.

d. Second year JSP seminar mix: for the four seminars, there were from 3 to 5 Sea Service and 1 to 2 Air Force students. This meets the requirement of at least one officer from each of the two non-host military departments per seminar.

5. Interagency representation within the JSP student body is limited. There is no interagency representation on the faculty.

6. For AY 18, the attrition rate was 18% (80 of 440). The First Year Director personally contacts each student who requests disenrollment in an attempt to retain the student. Those retention efforts achieve some success.

7. USAWC has begun to use the Joint Acculturation Survey as one mechanism to measure acculturation. Acculturation occurs inside and outside the virtual and face-to-face classrooms. Students report considerable interaction outside of class through message groups, texts, and phone calls.

(c) Suggestions.

1. Consider strengthening the program learning outcomes by specifically reflecting joint educational requirements or the commitment to joint and interagency cooperation.

2. If attrition causes the JSP seminar mix to become disproportionate, consider rebalancing the students throughout the program.

3. Continue to enable acculturation activities inside and outside of the classroom. Gather acculturation evidence and triangulate data from multiple sources (e.g., Joint Acculturation Survey [JAS] findings, curriculum mapping of intentional acculturation activities, student Service mix, Alumni Survey feedback). Use the guidance provided in the JAS Test Manual to validate the instrument for use at USAWC and expand analyses to support stronger acculturation claims.

4. Continue to seek student and faculty representation from DoD and non-DoD federal agencies to enhance the joint environment.

5. Given the numbers of Marine Corps students in DEP, consider asking the USMC to assign qualified Marine instructors to JSP.

(2) Standard 2 – Employ Predominately Active and Highly Effective Instructional Methods. Instructional methods should be appropriate to the subject matter and desired level of learning and should employ active student learning whenever feasible. The goals of the educational offerings are rigorous and challenging, requiring students to engage in critical thinking and active interaction.

(a) Finding. JSP meets this standard.

(b) Observations.

1. The JSP program employs active instructional methods to achieve learning outcomes. While in residence, instructional methods include seminar discussions, field research staff rides, and group exercises. Non-resident instructional methods include case studies, writing assignment, discussion forums, and reading. The number of faculty-led synchronous sessions is limited.

2. Observations by the PAJE team during visits to seminars indicated Socratic dialog, balanced participation by the students, and evidence of critical thinking. Faculty instructors actively engaged their students to participate within the seminar.

3. As a predominately distance education program, the learning and student management systems (LMS/SMS) are used to deliver much of the instruction and provide feedback/grades to students. Students and faculty are trained to take advantage of these tools.

4. Learning materials are provided to students either in print form or electronically through the LMS, thus little outside research is required.

5. DE2300, the optional online orientation course is a great introduction to the DEP/JSP program. Students who take the course are encouraged to demonstrate use of the LMS/SMS, write a 500-word diagnostic essay, participate in an online forum discussion, complete a biography, and take a skills test.

6. Guest speakers have minimal representation from other Services.

7. Collaborate sessions in year one are run by students who receive discussion questions and lesson outcomes from the course director. There are one to three unique sessions held in each course. Students are often relieved of course requirements if they volunteer to lead discussions.

(c) Suggestions.

1. Continue emphasizing active learning strategies throughout the JPME curriculum. Consider increasing the number of faculty-led interactions with students. Although students may be unable to attend all synchronous sessions, providing the opportunities for active interaction may increase learning, acculturation, and retention.

2. Consider mandating DE2300 for all students at the start of DEP.

3. Consider ways to increase Service diversity in the guest speaker program.

4. Consider requiring student attendance to a certain percentage of the Collaborate sessions to increase participation, learning, and acculturation. To ensure consistency across all assessments, consider requiring all students, including the Collaborate session leader, to complete all course assignments.

(3) Standard 3 – Assess Student Achievement. Each school/college should aggressively assess its students' performance. Educational goals and objectives should be clearly stated and students' performance should be measured against defined standards by appropriate assessment tools to identify whether desired educational outcomes are being achieved.

(a) Finding. JSP partially meets this standard.

(b) Observations.

1. In general, DEP has a student assessment program which includes both direct and indirect assessment of student learning; there are no differences between JSP and non-JSP. Each course directly evaluates students in the areas of contribution and written work, including an exam, papers, essays, forums, oral presentations, and exercises.

2. The JPME II JLOs are mapped (introduction, reinforcement, and assessment) to core courses, including identification of assessment method and associated level of Bloom's taxonomy. However, tasks and cognitive level do not align for all assessments. JLOs are not clearly linked to rubric elements in order to gauge student achievement in each area. This observation was noted in the 2015 DEP PAJE report.

3. All DEP courses have syllabi that follow a general format. Evaluative Requirements vary in content and level of specificity; overall course grading (i.e., weighting of the requirements) is not stated for all courses.

4. Course outcomes/objectives (DEP uses these terms interchangeably) are clearly identified on each syllabus and direct assessment of student learning is evident through examples of rubrics. However, assessments are not directly linked to specific learning outcomes (course/block outcomes) and rubrics are general in their design. Linkages between 1) evaluation requirements and course block outcomes, 2) course block outcomes and course objectives/outcomes, and 3) course objectives/outcomes and JLOs are not clear.

5. Grading across DEP is based on a 5-point scale: 1-5. The Communicative Arts Directive (CAD), which provides guidance for faculty in applying evaluation standards, includes the following:

Faculty assessment is largely holistic and subjective, but remains focused on the message trilogy: Content, Organization, and Style/Delivery... Content carries the most weight as it includes assessment of idea quality and argument strength... Each element of the message trilogy receives a numerical assessment that may include a plus or minus (+/-) to indicate relative strength within most rating categories. (p. 8)

In practice, DEP uses both common (strategic thinking, written communications, and oral communications) and course-specific rubrics. Rubrics generally contain one holistic evaluative criteria and do not

systematically provide numerical assessment for each element of the trilogy (some faculty provide a breakdown in the comment fields). Levels of mastery and descriptions of observable performance characteristics are provided but specific learning outcomes are not integrated into rubrics. Thus, there is no direct link to assess course block outcomes nor course learning objectives.

6. Faculty record student performance data in the SMS. Year 2 faculty assess all evaluative requirements for their own students. Year 1 faculty (military, DoD civilian, contractor) assess all Forums for their respective seminars; contract faculty are used to grade a majority of written requirements. Full-time faculty review 10% of contract faculty's assessments for quality control purposes. The Department of Distance Education (DDE) has a documented remediation policy that is strictly adhered to.

7. Both faculty and students indicate students receive quality feedback. Samples of graded papers confirm that faculty provide thoughtful and substantive feedback, which is often tied to learning outcomes. Faculty receive training from course directors on all elements of the respective courses, including assessment techniques. Course directors look at a sample of papers across seminars to ensure the intent of the assignment is being met and determine if refinement or recalibration is needed.

8. Faculty use Course Evaluation Reports (CERs) to document student achievement at the course level. CERs are standardized and record the overall grade. They also are used to assess level of performance in three areas using college-wide rubrics for strategic thinking, written communication, and oral communication. Faculty may also identify areas of 1) demonstrated excellence and 2) in need of refinement in relation to Senior Leader KSAs (strategic mindedness, technical/DoD-unique, and interpersonal). Students' abilities to demonstrate each Course Learning Outcome are also recorded using a 4-point scale. Course Learning Outcome data are not visible to students and used only for program evaluation. Narrative portions of the CER allow faculty to provide sufficient detail concerning academic progress towards mastering learning outcomes. A review of core course grades for JSP students indicate a well-balanced distribution; grade inflation does not appear to be an issue.

9. Students complete a survey at the end of each course. Raw data are provided to DDE and promulgated to individual faculty. Aggregate-level reports are subsequently produced and available to all faculty and students; hard copies are provided to senior leaders.

(c) Suggestions.

1. Continue to refine the process of student assessment. Consider implementing measures to ensure direct and clear alignment of block outcomes to course outcomes and mapping of outcomes to assessments.

2. Consider sorting evaluative criteria into separate elements and ensuring alignment to learning outcomes will ensure DEP is capturing evidence of student achievement and provide faculty with a more detailed framework for student assessment. Further, consider providing detailed rubrics to students in advance to provide a fuller understanding of expectations.

3. Consider disaggregating JSP student assessment data (direct and indirect) from non-JSP student assessment data to ensure both programs are attaining student learning outcomes.

4. Consider applying additional established resident USAWC program requirements to JSP (e.g., required writing diagnostic, research paper requirement). Ensure compliance with internal guidance and policies (e.g., 2018 Revision to USAWC Memo 351-15, Assessment Responsibilities, Policies, and Processes; Memo Subject: Implementing Oral Communication Skills Opportunities dated 13 Feb 2018).

5. Per CSWC-SSL Memo Subject: AY18 Curriculum Guidance dated 30 May 2017, consider taking steps to ensure all course directives identify the proportion of the overall grade derived from specific elements of student performance. Include this information on syllabi so students have a full understanding of how they will be assessed in each course.

(4) Standard 4 – Assess Program Effectiveness. Schools and colleges should conduct surveys of students, graduates, and their supervisors to determine curricula and educational effectiveness of their academic programs. Schools and colleges should ensure General and/or Flag Officer (G/FO) leadership periodically assesses the intended outcomes of the JPME accredited programs for currency, relevancy and completeness. Results of these analyses should be used to refine or develop curricula that continue to meet evolving mission requirements in the context of an ever-changing world. Curricula should be the product of a regular, rigorous and documented review process.

(a) Finding. JSP meets this standard.

(b) Observations.

1. DEP collects a myriad of indirect and direct data, including both quantitative and qualitative feedback. USAWC conducts surveys and focus groups with DEP students and implements Alumni and General Officer (Supervisor) Surveys. Data are reported at the aggregate level. Limited JSP-specific information is available (first JSP cohort graduated in AY17); the exception is for joint acculturation-related questions.

2. Data entered into CERs is provided in aggregate to the course directors for evaluation and continual improvement purposes.

3. Six program level outcomes (PLOs) have been developed for DEP. Although courses and general sources of evidence are linked to each PLO, evidence is not readily available to determine the degree to which PLOs are being achieved. USAWC is currently developing reports that will utilize CER data in assessing PLOs. Four of the six PLOs are course learning outcomes for the SRC. The capstone exercise in SRC provides a means for conducting a direct assessment of these PLOs and uses the standard strategic thinking and oral communications rubrics for assessment.

4. A combination of direct and indirect assessment data is used to refine curricula for continual improvement and to meet evolving mission requirements. Student, graduate, and General Officer/supervisor feedback, while not specific to JSP, supports overall satisfaction with DEP.

5. Curricula are the product of a regular, rigorous, and documented review process. These formal processes and events demonstrate a commitment to program evaluation and continual improvement. However, as noted in Standard 3, rubrics do not address learning outcomes individually, which may make it difficult to determine the degree to which DEP has developed knowledge, skills, and abilities for specific outcomes.

(c) Suggestions.

1. In accordance with USAWC Memo 351-15 Assessment Policy, outcomes at all levels should be observable, relevant, and achievable. Consider steps to ensure all outcomes (course block through PLOs) are measurable and use appropriate verbs associated with levels of Bloom's taxonomy for consistent and clear connections between tasks and level.

2. Consider taking actions to refine processes for assessing PLOs. Evidence should address attainment of outcomes and be derived

from student assessments, not only frequency of coverage. Evidence must show that students are reaching the Bloom's level intended for each assessment task.

(5) Standard 5 – Conduct Quality Faculty Recruitment: Selection, Assignment and Performance Assessment Program. Faculty should have the academic credentials, teaching skills and experience in joint and professional matters needed to teach in the schools and colleges. Faculty roles and responsibilities should be clearly documented. Schools and colleges should hold faculty accountable to clearly defined and measurable performance criteria and standards.

(a) Finding. JSP partially meets this standard.

(b) Observations.

1. As a whole, DDE faculty, including the JSP faculty team, are of high quality, possessing the broad range of academic credentials and expertise to support and enhance the curriculum and educational experiences of students. Interviews with students indicate a high level of satisfaction with the performance of faculty and the quality of instruction.

2. JSP relies on DDE faculty, and a dedicated subset of DDE faculty for JSP instruction. First Year Studies is taught by DDE faculty—a mix of full- and part-time military, contractors, and Title 10 civilians. Second Year Studies is delivered by the JSP faculty who are all military.

3. The military faculty mix and qualifications:

a. DEP First Year Studies military faculty mix: 100% Army. This exceeds the maximum threshold of 60% for host service. It does not meet the requirement of proportionality among each non-host military department.

b. JSP Second Year Studies military faculty mix: 60% Army (3.2), 22% Air Force (1.2), and 18% Sea Service (1.0). This meets the maximum threshold of 60% for host Service and the requirement of proportionality among each non-host military department.

c. First Year Studies qualification: complete data on all of the military faculty is not tracked.

d. JSP Second Year Studies qualification: 86% are JPME II graduates or Joint Qualified Officers. This meets the minimum threshold of 75%.

4. Faculty roles, responsibilities, performance criteria, and standards are well defined and documented in USAWC Regulation 690-12 *Employment under Title 10* and USAWC Regulation 600.10 *Military Faculty at the US Army War College*.

5. Over the last two years, USAWC leadership and administration, in collaboration with the Faculty Council, have made concerted efforts to address areas of concern related to faculty credentials, performance, and pay. Notable initiatives include, the “2017 Blue Ribbon Panel on Faculty” and the study panel to revise 690-12. Interviews with faculty, and results from a recent faculty survey indicate that these, and other efforts, are yielding marked improvement in the faculty’s overall level of job satisfaction and relationship with administration.

(c) Suggestions.

1. Assign the appropriate mix of JSP military faculty as instructors in the First Year Studies while retaining the proper mix in the Second Year Studies.

2. Track the OPMEP-required qualifications of military faculty teaching in the full two-year JSP.

(6) Standard 6 – Conduct Faculty Development Programs For Improving Instructional Skills and Increasing Subject Matter Mastery. Each school and college should have a faculty development program to refine teaching skills, improve instructional methods, maintain currency in subject areas and encourage further professional development. Policy and resources must support the faculty development program.

(a) Finding. JSP meets this standard.

(b) Observations.

1. USAWC has a robust and well-defined process of faculty professional development that is conducted on four complementary and inter-related levels as described in USAWC Regulation 600-1, *Faculty Development*. These levels include Institutional, Organizational, Departmental, and Individual. Activities and engagements on each level promote professional and personal growth; the development of skills related to subject matter expertise; and proficiency in faculty roles and responsibilities.

2. DDE has established an effective array of informal mentoring opportunities and formal course review workshops (Forum Pony) to develop new faculty and teaching teams on instructional

strategies and subject areas. For example, prior to the start of the academic year, the Director of First Year Studies published a yearlong schedule of meetings and training events for instructors and staff.

3. All new faculty are required to complete new faculty orientation and a prescribed sequence of faculty development workshops in the first year of their assignment. Plans are also in place for Course Directors and Lesson Authors to complete a Course Developers course, and for returning faculty to engage in continuing education and a mandatory refresher workshop every five years.

4. The recently hired Professor of Educational Methodology has initiated a redesign and expansion of the USAWC faculty development program that has potential to strengthen faculty development and improve the quality of instruction. New or revised activities include the publication of a quarterly Educational Methodology Newsletter, expansion of New Faculty Orientation, and the creation of the New Faculty Orientation Handbook. Faculty have been complimentary of these changes.

5. USAWC faculty professional development is funded from multiple sources. The FY2018 Office of the Provost spend plan earmarks \$50,000 for faculty professional development. DDE provides additional funding for JSP faculty development opportunities. USAWC faculty are eligible to apply for the Strategic Studies Institute's Faculty Research Grant Program. This grant program, as described in USAWC Regulation No. 11, provides faculty access to Temporal (time off), Fiscal (money to defray research expenses) and Minerva (research) opportunities. Faculty confirmed that the institution is consistently generous in providing time off and financial support for professional development and TDY assignments.

(c) Suggestion. The New Faculty Orientation Handbook has valuable content on adult learning and teaching methods that is valuable for new and veteran faculty. Consider rebranding and expanding this guide to make it applicable to all faculty.

(7) Standard 7 – Provide Institutional Resources to Support the Educational Process. Each institution must have a library or learning resource center, informational resources, financial resources, and physical resources that meet the needs of all users and supports the mission and programs of the institution.

(a) Finding. JSP meets this standard.

(b) Observations.

1. USAWC provides library, financial, facilities, and informational/educational technology support for JSP.

2. The USAWC Library staff is customer focused and supports the information and research needs of JSP students and faculty. Library collections are robust and support the curriculum. A librarian is assigned to DDE faculty and students to provide dedicated research and instruction services. Students and faculty had favorable comments about the support and services provided by the library.

3. Distance and resident students have equal access to library services and resources. The library provides on-campus and remote access to online research databases, electronic journals, and other digital resources. Students and faculty can use the ask-a-librarian form on the web site to request research assistance or contact librarians via phone or email. The library will mail print materials to JSP students if materials they need are unavailable in digital formats.

4. USAWC provides the library with a sufficient budget for print and online collections. However, the cost of journal and database subscriptions continue to rise annually, in most cases exceeding the rate of inflation.

5. The USAWC Communicative Arts department provides support for student writing and communication skills. However, this support is primarily focused on resident students.

6. The Communicative Arts Directive applies to all students. USAWC currently uses contractors to provide writing support for first year JSP students. Two new full-time Title 10 positions have been approved for FY2020 to strengthen writing support to all students.

7. The learning and student management systems are stable. The Instructional Support Group (ISG) provides instructional design and educational technology support for JSP. Faculty and students from JSP commented that the educational and classroom technology, as well as support staff, meets their needs. The faculty commented that network latency issues sometimes cause course slowdowns and crashes.

8. The infrastructure within Root Hall is outdated and the building is seen as inadequate for providing a 21st century learning experience. However, plans are on track to replace Root Hall with a new academic building in 2022. The library, including a knowledge commons, will be housed in the new building and should provide sufficient learning spaces for students.

9. Current and out-year funding levels will support the USAWC mission, with a steady increase each year. However, administrators reported some uncertainty about future funding levels due to downward pressure on Army funding of professional military education and a proposed realignment of USAWC to TRADOC.

10. The Army War College Foundation funds an assortment of educational enhancements including writing awards, named chairs, honoraria, academic conferences, library acquisitions and more.

11. The library has four full-time librarians dedicated to providing research and instruction support for all USAWC programs. If the requirement for research and instruction support increases without an increase in personnel, as it has with the addition of the Army Strategic Education Program, the ability to provide timely support and the quality of overall library support for all academic programs could diminish.

(c) Suggestions.

1. USAWC Library should consider expanding e-book collections to broaden access to materials for distance students. Building e-book collections and controlling the expansion of print collections will become increasingly important when the library moves into the new academic building with a smaller footprint allocated for print materials.

2. USAWC should consider if the distribution of annual library funding is commensurate with the rising cost of subscriptions.

3. USAWC Library should consider exploring opportunities to engage more with distance education students. For example, consider embedding librarians and learning objects such as guides and video tutorials in the learning management system where students and faculty spend most of their time. Also, consider providing synchronous online library instruction for distance education students as a follow-on to the initial library orientation.

4. USAWC should continue to assess the impact of academic program growth on college support functions.

c. Joint Learning Areas and Objectives. JSP partially meets JLA 3 and meets all other JPME II learning areas.

(1) Learning Area 1 – National Strategies

(a) Associated Learning Objectives.

1. Apply key strategic concepts, critical thinking, and analytical frameworks to formulate and execute strategy.

2. Analyze the integration of all instruments of national power in complex, dynamic, and ambiguous environments to attain objectives at the national and theater-strategic levels.

3. Evaluate historical and/or contemporary security environments and applications of strategies across the range of military operations.

4. Apply strategic security policies, strategies and guidance used in developing plans across the range of military operations and domains to support national objectives.

5. Evaluate how the capabilities and limitations of the U.S. Force structure affect the development and implementation of security, defense and military strategies.

(b) Finding. JSP meets this Learning Area.

(c) Observations.

1. JSP incorporates critical thinking throughout the curriculum. Forums and written essays across the courses consistently mandate that the students raise their level of thinking.

2. Staff rides and exercises offer excellent opportunities to analyze the integration of the elements of national power and national security strategy in a historical context. The staff rides to the Antietam and Gettysburg battlefields and the matrix game in a South China Sea scenario offer excellent vehicles to achieve analysis, synthesis, and evaluation of both historical and contemporary security environments.

3. The curriculum crosswalk matrix does not reflect the contributions of DE2322 to JLA 1. As the culminating course of the curriculum, DE2322 should draw together the vast majority of the JLOs.

(d) Suggestion. Consider crediting DE2322 for higher order cognitive outcomes.

(2) Learning Area 2 – Joint Warfare, Theater Strategy and Campaigning for Traditional and Irregular Warfare in a Joint, Interagency, Intergovernmental and Multinational Environment.

(a) Associated Learning Objectives.

1. Evaluate the principles of joint operations, joint military doctrine, joint functions (command and control, intelligence, fires, movement and maneuver, protection, and sustainment), and emerging concepts across the range of military operations.

2. Evaluate how theater strategies, campaigns, and major operations achieve national strategic goals across the range of military operations.

3. Apply an analytical framework that addresses the factors politics, geography, society, culture, and religion play in shaping the desired outcomes of policies, strategies and campaigns.

4. Analyze the role of Operational Contract Support (OCS) in supporting Service capabilities and joint functions to meet strategic objectives considering the effects contracting and contracted support have on the operational environment.

5. Evaluate how strategic level plans anticipate and respond to surprise, uncertainty, and emerging conditions.

6. Evaluate key classical, contemporary and emerging concepts, including IO and cyber space operations, doctrine, and traditional/irregular approaches to war.

(b) Finding. JSP meets this learning area.

(c) Observations.

1. The curriculum effectively examines joint warfare, theater strategy, and campaigning for traditional and irregular warfare in a JIIM environment.

2. There is no coverage of religion's influence as one of multiple other factors within an analytical framework in shaping the desired outcomes of policies, strategies, and campaigns (JLO 2.c.).

3. The capstone exercise matrix game during SRC enhances the student's ability to evaluate strategic plans developed earlier in the program and enables student response to surprise, uncertainty, and emerging conditions in a maritime-based problem set focused on the South China Sea—a contemporary issue.

4. JSP has done a notable job adding OCS to the curriculum given the relatively short time since it was incorporated into the OPMEP (2015) and subsequent issuance of JPME integration

guidance in the Joint OCS Curriculum Development Guide (JOCDG, v.3.0, June 2017).

5. JSP is leveraging the Joint OCS Essentials for Commanders and Staffs (JOECS) course on Joint Knowledge Online (JKO) to provide consistent foundational OCS doctrine and issues for in-depth classroom discussion. Use of the JOECS course offers one quantitative means of assessing student understanding of OCS since it requires completion of “checks on learning” and a post-test before issuing a completion certificate. There was no evidence, other than completion of the JOECS course, of assessment of student understanding of OCS (JLO 2.d.).

(d) Suggestions.

1. Consider incorporating more material focused on the role of religion.

2. Consider associating the capstone exercise matrix game with JLO 2.e. within the curriculum crosswalk matrix.

3. Consider more fully integrating OCS and commercial support to operations earlier in the curriculum. This topic was not addressed in the first year and a half of the two-year curriculum.

4. Consider developing criteria and processes to assess and document student level of learning and student understanding for JLO 2.d.

(3) Learning Area 3 – National and Joint Planning Systems and Processes for the Integration of JIIM Capabilities.

(a) Associated Learning Objectives.

1. Analyze how DoD, interagency and intergovernmental structures, processes, and perspectives reconcile, integrate, and apply national ends, ways, and means.

2. Analyze the operational planning and resource allocation processes.

3. Evaluate the integration of joint, interagency, intergovernmental and multinational capabilities, including all Service and Special Operations Forces, in campaigns across the range of military operations in achieving strategic objectives.

4. Value a joint perspective and appreciate the increased power available to commanders through joint, interagency, intergovernmental, and multinational efforts.

5. Analyze the likely attributes of the future joint force and the challenges faced to plan, organize, prepare, conduct, and assess operations.

(b) Finding. JSP partially meets this learning area.

(c) Observations.

1. The curriculum drives students to the analysis level of learning for ends, ways, means, and risks.

2. The curriculum crosswalk matrix notes that only DE2316 and DE2320 address JLO 3.b. However, neither course appears to address the resource allocation process required in that JLO. This issue is specifically addressed in DE2322.

3. The blended format is ideally suited for achieving the requirements of JLO 3.b. However, the divergence of DEP and JSP at the end of the first year makes it difficult to judge how well JSP enables joint acculturation. While there are approximately 41 days of Forums in the first year, these online discussions are not delivered in a joint environment (joint student body with joint faculty) and may have no impact on joint attitudes and perspectives.

4. Each online course has Forums as part of its evaluation process. However, five of them take no credit for supporting JLO 3.d. As noted above, an argument can be made to discount the contribution of DE2300, DE2301, DE2303, and DE2304. DE2318, however, is relatively early in the second year (JSP) and is an excellent opportunity for students to begin discerning Service cultural differences in the postings and responses of others.

5. In addition to the online collaboration achieved in Forums, there are synchronous sessions where students meet to discuss requirements for specific lessons. Additionally, discussions with students identified an extensive informal dialogue ongoing outside of class time. Both contribute to the achievement of JLO 3.d., but neither is easily quantifiable.

6. There is a discrepancy between defined learning outcomes and the verbs used to describe JLO 3.d. Specifically, JLO 3.d. has an affective outcome: Value. The verb “value” is never listed as an action verb within the affective domain. However, “value” is listed as an action verb for the cognitive task of evaluation. The learning outcomes matrix listed value, analysis, and evaluation for this affective outcome. The matrix conflates affective and cognitive verbs, making it difficult to understand the intended contribution for three of the five courses listed.

(d) Suggestions.

1. Consider updating the curriculum crosswalk matrix to reflect the support for the resource allocation process required in JLO 3.b.

2. Consider crediting DE2318 with support of JLO 3.d. in the curriculum crosswalk matrix. When the JSP joint mix expands to the full two years, recognize DE2300, DE2301, DE2303, and DE2304, as well.

3. Consider modifying the curriculum crosswalk matrix to reflect affective outcomes in support of JLO 3.d.

(4) Learning Area 4 – Command, Control and Coordination.

(a) Associated Learning Objectives.

1. Evaluate the strategic-level options available in the joint, interagency, intergovernmental, and multinational environment.

2. Analyze the factors of Mission Command as it relates to mission objectives, forces, and capabilities that support the selection of a command and control option.

3. Analyze the opportunities and challenges affecting command and control created in the joint, interagency, intergovernmental, and multinational environment across the range of military operations, to include leveraging

(b) Finding. JSP meets this learning area.

(c) Observations.

1. All objectives are primarily taught and assessed in the second year within DE2319 and DE2320.

2. The options, challenges, and opportunities of command, control, coordination, and mission command within a JIIM environment are initially examined as a course unit of study within the joint functions block for DE2319. Learning within this joint area continues using OPERATION HUSKY as an historical case study that includes an essay requirement focused in part on command and control as a joint function. These concepts culminate in practical exercises for both DE2319 and DE2320 focused on a South China Sea scenario.

3. JLA 4 is also reinforced and supported by multiple guest speakers throughout the two-year program.

4. The learning levels are at the *evaluate* and *analysis* levels. The program employs multiple methods of instruction including readings, case studies, writing requirements, and collaborative practice exercises. Active learning is used through Forums and collaborative engagement in practical exercises.

(d) Suggestions. None.

(5) Learning Area 5 – Strategic Leadership and the Profession of Arms.

(a) Associated Learning Objectives.

1. Evaluate the skills, character attributes and behaviors needed to lead in a dynamic joint, interagency, intergovernmental, and multinational strategic environment.

2. Evaluate critical strategic thinking, decision making, and communication by strategic leaders.

3. Evaluate how strategic leaders develop innovative organizations capable of operating in dynamic, complex, and uncertain environments; anticipate change; and respond to surprise and uncertainty.

4. Evaluate how strategic leaders communicate a vision; challenge assumptions; and anticipate, plan, implement, and lead strategic change in complex joint or combined organizations.

5. Evaluate historic and contemporary applications of the elements of mission command by strategic-level leaders in pursuit of national objectives.

6. Evaluate how strategic leaders foster responsibility, accountability, selflessness and trust in complex joint or combined organizations.

7. Evaluate how strategic leaders establish and sustain an ethical climate among joint and combined forces, and develop/preserve public trust with their domestic citizenry.

(b) Finding. JSP meets this learning area.

(c) Observations.

1. All of the objectives are appropriately addressed throughout both the first and second years of the program.

2. Strategic leadership is a primary focus of the USAWC as articulated in their mission. The program is focused on strategic leadership beginning with DE2301 in year one and culminating with DE2322. Additionally, every course in the program, with the exception of one, is identified as supporting the strategic leadership and profession of arms JLOs.

3. Multiple elective and graduate seminar offerings support many of the JLOs.

4. Strategic leadership within JSP is supported by the USAWC Center for Strategic Leadership (CSL) with exercise development, guest instructors, and electives.

5. DEP has a robust guest speaker program that brings in senior level military and civilian leaders that address issues of strategic leadership innovation, civil-military relations, ethics, and operating within a dynamic JIIM environment at the strategic level.

6. The learning levels are at the *evaluate* level. JSP employs multiple methods of instruction including lectures, guided discussions, readings, case studies, writing requirements, and collaborative practice exercises focused on strategic leadership and the profession of arms. All of these JLOs are demonstrated and assessed multiple times throughout the curriculum.

(d) Suggestions. None.

(6) Joint Doctrine.

(a) Finding. All joint doctrine publication references are current.

(b) Observations.

1. References to joint doctrine within the JSP curriculum are numerous and of a volume greater than any other JPME program. All joint doctrine publication references are current and relevant to the JSP curriculum and in accordance with applicable Chairman's policy.

2. The USAWC Office of Concepts and Doctrine provides a valuable link between the entire faculty and the joint doctrine development community. This office has visibility into all JSP courseware and can communicate with course directors to ensure doctrine references within the curriculum remain current.

(c) Suggestions. None.