

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

16 April 2014 / 1300 – 1700

17 April 2014 / 0800 – 1400

Open Meeting

Georgia Tech Research Institute (GTRI)

1700 N. Moore Street, Suite 1910

Arlington, VA 22209

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 members are encouraged to submit Minority Statements if they disagree with the majority position, and when submitted, they are attached to the final Board of Visitors' report for consideration by the Department of the Air Force.

I hereby certify that, to the best of my knowledge, the minutes are accurate and complete.

Approved as written:



MURIEL A. HOWARD

Chair, AU Board of Visitors

June 20, 2014

- 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: AFIT Subcommittee Meeting Minutes
- Section VII: AU Response to AFIT Subcommittee Recommendation

Section I: Board Attendance

A. Board Members attending the meeting:

1. Mr. Norman Augustine
2. Col Robert Beasley, USAF Ret *
3. Dr. Rufus Glasper
4. Dr. Muriel Howard
5. Dr. Benjamin Lambeth
6. Gen Duncan McNabb, USAF, Ret
7. CMSAF Gerald Murray, USAF, Ret
8. Maj Gen Richard Paul, USAF, Ret
9. Maj Gen Ron Sega, USAF, Ret
10. Mr. Fletcher Wiley

*denotes locally residing board member attending as a member of the public

B. Members of the AU BOV absent:

1. Fr. William Beauchamp
2. Mrs. Mary Boies, JD
3. Dr. Ding Jo Currie **
4. Dr. Ann Millner
5. Dr. Ricardo Romo

**denotes board member absent due to pending membership renewal

C. Air University and other personnel attending the meeting:

1. Lt Gen David Fadok, AU/CC and President
2. Dr. Chris Cain, AU/CF and Designated Federal Officer
3. Dr. Todd Stewart, AFIT/CL
4. Col Jeffrey Smith, SAASS/CC
5. CMSgt Timothy Horn, AU/CCC
6. Ms. Pamela Fitzgerald, SAF/AA
7. Ms. Diana Bunch, Designated Federal Officer
8. Ms. Lisa Arnold, AU/CFB
9. Ms. Kimberly Russo

Section II: Board Activities and Discussions

A. The Air University (AU) Board of Visitors (BOV) meeting convened at 1300 hours on 16 April 2014 in the Board Room of suite 1910, Georgia Tech Research Institute (GTRI), 1700 N. Moore Street, Arlington, VA. Dr. Muriel Howard chaired the meeting. Dr. Howard informed the Board members that this formal meeting was open to the public and was initially advertised in the Federal Register on 14 March 2014 (Vol.79, No. 50). Dr. Cain, Designated Federal Officer for the Board, was present during the meeting and a quorum was met.

B. Opening Comments: Dr. Howard opened the meeting thanking the members for their dedication to the Air Force and their commitment to Air University despite the challenging membership reappointment process. She thanked Col (ret) Beasley and his assistant, Mrs. Cheryl Graham, for the use of the Georgia Tech Research Institute (GTRI) Arlington facility. Col (ret) Beasley presented an overview of the GTRI facility and mission, and extended a welcome to the BOV from Georgia Tech's President, Dr. G. P. "Bud" Peterson. Dr. Howard extended farewell wishes to Diana Bunch for her work with the Board over the past several years; all Board members echoed similar sentiments. Dr. Howard presented topics of national concern affecting colleges and universities; "Topics that may be keeping presidents up at night." The six (6) topics generated much discussion.

1. Sexual Assault: Dr. Howard met with Vice President Biden's staff concerning sexual assault in America's colleges and universities. Stringent ratings of 4K+ institutions are due out summer 2014. The Board asked if Air University is affected by sexual assault. The response: No empirical data reflects a pervasive problem in Air University, more incidents are reported in the training environment; education is viewed as a part of the solution.
2. Diversity: Dr. Howard reported census data has been extrapolated and results reveal Hispanic and African American women's average age is in the twenties whereas the average age for Caucasian women is in the forties. Higher education leaders are studying how colleges and universities will prepare for this diversity shift over the next ten years.
3. Degree Completion: College enrollment continues to increase, but degree completion and graduation rates remain a challenge. Commissions are trying to galvanize presidents to promote the Higher Education Reauthorization Act. It was noted, as student aid increases so does tuition.
4. STEM versus STEAM: The recent push has been to increase Science Technology Engineering and Math (STEM) graduates but tuition for STEM degrees appears differential. The Arts and Humanities communities have begun an initiative titled STEAM (Science, Technology, Engineering, Arts, and Math) citing the need for a continued focus on the arts and humanities to stimulate creativity.
5. Technology: Competence in the use of technology remains a concern to employers. Institutions of higher education appear to be leap-frogging into technology. More colleges and universities are partnering with business and industry. Students today are

not as studious as in the past. They spend less time in the classroom and are more oral and audio oriented; they “capture and retain information on the fly”. Students today have higher test scores but have a weak moral compass. Transparency, fostered by social media, is affecting society and the way we teach and learn.

6. Leadership: As the baby-boom generation retires, attention is turning toward future educational leaders. How do we develop leaders of character who possess strong critical thinking skills? There is no panacea but the Board’s consensus is the military is highly respected in producing leaders who can think critically and make well-reasoned decisions. They applaud Air University and look to AU to be a purveyor of culture concerning these topics.

C. AU Commander and President’s Discussion: Lt Gen David Fadok opened his discussion thanking the Board for their patience during the turbulent membership renewal process. He stated the Command Board of Advisors (CBOA) meeting time of 1-hour was insufficient, but the MAJCOM Vice Commanders were in agreement with AFIT’s Value Proposition. Gen Fadok thanked Ms. Bunch for her dedication and loyalty as the Designated Federal Officer (DFO) to the Board. He continues to consult with former and present Board members as the hiring process for the new Vice President of Academic Affairs concludes. Gen Fadok addressed four (4) focus areas:

1. Professional Military Education (PME) Transformation Update:
 - a. Enlisted PME: Airman Leadership School (ALS) is conducted 100% in-residence while the Non-Commissioned Officer Academy (NCOA) and Senior NCO Academy (SNCOA) employ a blended learning concept. The CSAF directed reinstatement of the Chief Leadership Course (CLC); resource and staffing options for it are being studied. Gen Fadok noted the beta tests for the NCOA and SNCOA went extremely well. The Board noted that ALS exhibited higher test scores and retention rates; therefore, the Air Force should maintain its policy of 100% resident attendance for junior enlisted students.
 - b. Officer PME: Squadron Officer School (SOS) is being transformed to a five week, resident program to meet 100% resident attendance for all active duty company grade officers. Air War College (AWC) and Air Command and Staff College (ACSC) resident programs will continue their intensive 10-month programs of study. The vast majority of officers receive intermediate and senior leader education via distance learning (DL) formats. Future OPME DL courses will not mirror resident courses; rather a tailored menu of courses will be available that target the immediate professional development needs of its students.
2. Financial Challenges and Resource Issues: An AETC manpower team visited AU to validate authorizations for the CLC. Funding requirements are being prepared for insertion into the FY16 POM. The SOS faculty is confident they can achieve the minimum basic developmental education learning objectives in the new 5-week program.

Bottom line, “We will transform as resources allow us to transform”.

3. Air University recently formed the “Cyber Air Corps Tactical School” to generate research and collaboration among US government and DOD personnel, civilian academics and international experts in the cyberspace domain. AFIT obtained approval to rename the project “Consortium for the Advancement of Cyber Thinking and Strategy (C-ACTS)”. The consortium is a strategic level enterprise whose goal is to collaboratively develop policy and strategy, and to consider legal issues surrounding cyber security and cyber warfare. The Air Force Research Institute’s (AFRI) Cyber Symposium an annual event that brings cyber experts together in a think-tank environment; it has been recognized by the CSAF and SECAF for its intellectual contributions to cyber issues.
4. Non-DOD Conference Attendance: Although the SECAF supported exempting AU from this policy, Air University’s request was rejected by DOD. At the Joint Military Education Coordination Council, the J-7 committed to re-engage through the CJCS. In the interim, a 3-tiered approval mechanism has reduced approval times.

D. Vice President for Academic Affairs Discussion: Dr. Chris Cain addressed the Board thanking them for their support while he is dual-hatted as both the acting Vice President and Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs. Dr. Cain discussed Fifth-Year-Interim-Review (FYIR), Joint Accreditation, and the execution phase of OPME Transformation.

1. Fifth-Year-Interim-Review (FYIR) Update: The FYIR draft compliance certification is on schedule to meet internal and external deadlines. AU/CF has determined the institution is in compliance with the SACSCOC Principles of Accreditation. The QEP, “Cross Cultural Competence” may be “best in show.” A peer review will be coordinated with Marine Corp University (MCU), who is also SACSCOC accredited.
2. Joint Accreditation: Air Command and Staff College (ACSC) resident program and the On-Line Master’s Degree Program (OLMP) underwent the Process for Accreditation of Joint Education (PAJE) assessment in January 2014. The programs were in compliance with CJCS standards and received reaffirmation of accreditation through 2019. Air War College will undergo PAJE visit in October 2014.
3. OPME Transformation Execution Phase: ACSC’s resident program and the OLMP are responsive to emerging national security issues and meet the needs of the Air Force for leadership development. Focused studies offer three concentrations: 1) Joint Warfare; 2) Leadership; and 3) Operational Warfare. The curriculum is hierarchal consisting of Leadership, Warfare Studies, and Security Studies. 80% of officers currently complete PME on-line. The Air War College is considering the feasibility of developing a DL program accredited to offer Joint PME, Phase II.

E. Core Values Presentation: Col Jeff Smith, Commandant of the School of Advanced Air and Space Studies (SAASS), demonstrated an interactive briefing designed to enhance human cognition through affective learning. The presentation is flexible enough to adapt to any contextually based behavior. The program is an AU outreach teaching tool designed to develop character and internalize knowledge-generating, self-discovery in difficult subject areas such as ethics, values, professionalism, etc.

F. Critical Thinking Presentation: Col Jeff Smith, SAASS Commandant, presented an overview of “ThinkEnomics” a 5-hour course designed to engineer self-discovery and create an environment of critical thinking. The course delineates creative thinking and effective communication to create developmental opportunities for leadership and influence.

G. AFIT Subcommittee Out-brief: Maj Gen (ret) Richard Paul, Chair of the AFIT Subcommittee, provided a subcommittee out-brief to the full Board for review and discussion. The Board approved the subcommittee meeting minutes contained in Section VI.

H. AFIT Overview: Dr. Todd Stewart, Director and Chancellor, Air Force Institute of Technology (AFIT) provided an update highlighting AFIT’s value proposition, its schools, accreditation, and structure.

I. Honorary Degree Nomination: The Board discussed honorary degree nominations and provided their endorsement for the next nominee.

J. Departing Board Members: The Board currently has no departing members.

K. The Board’s requests, observations, and recommendations were presented to Gen Fadok on Thursday, 17 April 2014, and are included in Sections IV of these minutes.

L. Dr. Howard welcomed any comments from the public. There were no comments.

M. The meeting was adjourned at 1:55 p.m. on Thursday, 17 April 2014.

Section III: Board Actions

- A. The November 2013 BOV Meeting Minutes were approved and signed on 24 December 2014.
- B. Future Meeting Dates. The Board requested the November meeting be held in conjunction with Lt Gen Fadok's retirement ceremony if possible.
- C. Review of Mission Statement, Fiscal Stability, Institutional Policies, and Foundations. The Board reviewed the fiscal stability and institutional policies and recommendations, if any, are listed in Section IV of these minutes.
- D. Academic Policies (e.g. faculty hiring, curriculum, program changes). The Board reviewed various academic issues and recommendations, if any, are listed in Section IV of these minutes.
- E. Board Membership Changes. AU is awaiting OSD approval for reappointments from the cancelled Academic Affairs Subcommittee back to the main BOV committee. Four (4) Board memberships expire next year: two (2) academic professionals, two (2) business/industry professionals, and one (1) (former) military professional. Submit nominations NLT 10 May 2014.
- F. Bylaws. The Board reviewed the Bylaws and made no content changes.
- G. Board Recommendations. The Board approved all new recommendations which are reflected in Section IV of these minutes.
- H. Closed Meeting. No portion of the April 2014 meeting was closed.
- 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 04-2014-01: Discuss force shaping initiatives and how they affect AU and AFIT programs during the Nov 14 BOV.

Request 04-2014-02: Ensure force shaping discussions do not affect students in the pipeline – to include preserving active duty service commitments for graduates.

Request 04-2014-03: Examine how younger students are studying, learning, and retaining knowledge in relation to the advancement of technology.

Request 04-2014-04: Host fall 2014 BOV meeting in tandem with Gen Fadok’s retirement.

Request 04-2014-05: Request a comprehensive review of the Fifth-Year-Interim-Review (FYIR) report during the Nov 14 BOV.

Request 04-2014-06: Host a BOV meeting at AFIT, Wright-Patterson AFB Ohio in CY2015.

Request 04-2014-07: Consider bringing all joint service Federal Advisory Committee Act (FACA) boards together for a consolidated meeting with the Secretary of Defense (SECDEF).

B. Observations:

Observation 04-2014-01: The board agrees pursuing an exemption for “speedy approval” of requests for non-DOD conferences is essential for faculty development, retention and accreditation.

Observation 04-2014-02: If you undermine education, you undermine the foundation of the future.

Observation 04-2014-03: The BOV supports Blended Learning but a ‘note of concern’ exists for consuming more of Airman’s time.

Observation 04-2014-04: Applaud AU for pursuing joint support for non-DOD conference exemption resolution.

Observation 04-2014-05: Leaders need to better address the use of social media and technology regarding depiction of and one’s character, integrity and professionalism.

C. Recommendations:

Recommendation 04-2014-01: Consider augmenting the 5-week SOS program with a blended learning component to reinforce key learning outcomes.

Recommendation 04-2014-02: Implement a more deliberate return on investment (ROI) policy – a predictable pipeline of students tracked through the ranks for AFIT STEM graduates.

Recommendation 04-2014-03: Consider a more systematic developmental and assignment policy for enlisted AFIT graduates.

Recommendation 04-2014-04: Revise force shaping policy to preserve investments in education / STEM qualified graduates.

Recommendation 04-2014-05: Reinforce support for the Education with Industry program.

Recommendation 04-2014-06: Decision makers should know what they are organizationally giving-up (losing) as well as what they are gaining when resource decisions are made.

**Section V: Status on Previous Meeting Requests, Observations,
And Recommendations as of 17 April 2014**
(Numbering Key: MM/YYYY/##)

A. Agenda Requests:

Request 11-2013-01: Brief CESG survey results again once an acceptable sample size is obtained.

AU Response: An acceptable sample size is expected at the end of the calendar year. CESG survey results will be provided during the April 2015 BOV meeting. [**Recommended Action: OPEN**]

Request 11-2013-02: The Board would like to see faculty data regarding turn over, recruitment, etc.

AU Response: We will provide a background paper and/or briefing during the November 2014 board meeting. [**Recommended Action: OPEN**]

Request 11-2013-03: Request to see data on the beta testing for NCOA and SOS when data is available.

AU Response: There is no beta test currently underway within SOS. Changes to the SOS DL Program were implemented in early 2013 while changes to the SOS Residence Program are currently going through approval via AETC and CORONA. NCOA beta test is not scheduled to start until August 2014 if enough students complete Course 15 prior to 1 June 2014. If not, the NCOA Beta test will be delayed until October 2014. [**Recommended Action: MONITOR**]

Request 07-2012-09: The AFIT subcommittee reviewed the current status of the SECNAV/SECAF MOA and associated memorandum of understanding (MOU) and 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 scheduled meeting between AFIT and the NPS was postponed. AFIT will provide a summary at the March 2015 meeting to the AFIT Subcommittee. [**Recommended Action: OPEN**]

B. Observations:

Observation 11-2013-01: AFIT has identified and/or is implementing a number of initiatives which, while driven by dramatically reduced budgets, should be retained even in an eventual environment of restored or increased budgets. Examples observed by the subcommittee: for the Graduate School of Engineering & Management, bundling or harmonizing degree programs with related professional certification courses (e.g., acquisition certification) to reduce TDY costs and more efficiently utilize student time (being examined); for the School of Systems & Logistics,

tailoring short courses on a customer-by-customer basis for on-site delivery to these customers, versus bringing students TDY to AFIT for a one-size-fits-all course offering (being implemented); for the Civil Engineer School, making more extensive use of web-based and distance learning offerings to customers to reduce TDY costs, with a goal of additional distance learning utilization while retaining a core of residence programs, and using an optimum mix of each (being implemented). The subcommittee applauds these initiatives and encourages AFIT to share them at the AU and AETC levels.

AU Response: Concur. [**Recommended Action: CLOSED**]

Observation 11-2013-02: The subcommittee applauds these initiatives because of their relevance in helping to tell the AFIT story to the broader stakeholder community, and to illustrate the utilization and reach of AFIT graduates via post-graduation assignments throughout various agencies and organizations within the DOD community. Continuing and strengthening these initiatives is fully consistent with AFIT's Institutional Advancement initiative, and can play an important role in telling the AFIT story during this fiscally constrained environment.

AU Response: Concur. [**Recommended Action: CLOSED**]

Observation 11-2013-03: Throughout the two-day visit, the subcommittee repeatedly noted the debilitating effect that the OMB directive is having on non-DOD conference attendance. Attendance at non- government conferences, such as professional associations, is critical for faculty and graduate students to maintain proficiency, meet needs associated with professional advancement, interchange technical information (tech transfer) throughout the broader technical community, and advance the state of the art. The subcommittee recognizes that extensive efforts to eliminate or soften this restriction have already been pursued by multiple stakeholders across the government technical community, thus leading the subcommittee to document the concern in the form of an observation as opposed to a recommendation.

AU Response: Concur. [**Recommended Action: CLOSED**]

C. Recommendations:

Recommendation 11-2013-03: Recommend SECAF provides AU maximum flexibility in command decision over use and allocation of funds by new wording or new exception in policy. Interaction with civilian academic institutions and agencies in the form of meeting and conference attendance to present published papers and research and to pursue faculty development is critical to maintaining a high quality academic institution.

AU Response: Partial Concur. AU pursued an exemption to the current non-DOD conference guidance that would allow delegation of approval authority to the AU Commander and President; however, this exemption was disapproved. The AETC vice Commander has authority to approve attendance at non-DoD conferences if the total cost to the Air Force is less than \$20K. This has provided some relief to the timeline for approval to attend non-DoD conferences. For major conferences in AU's core academic disciplines (e.g., Society for Military History, International Security, etc.), the numbers of requested attendees will drive the cost above the \$20K limit, thus requiring USecAF approval.

At the recent Military Education Coordinating Committee, all Joint institutions expressed frustration with the non-DoD conference approval process. Lt Gen Waldhauser, the J-7, indicated that he would relay those concerns to the CJCS.

Approval authority for all other mission critical TDYs has been delegated to wing and center commander equivalents by the AETC Commander. [**Recommended Action: CLOSED**]

Recommendation 11-2013-04: Recommend AU extends the Senior Non-Commissioned Officer Academy beta test from the sterile environment to the field before proceeding further.

AU Response: Concur. The initial beta testing of the resident SNCOA Advance Leadership Experience (ALE) was highly successful. As a result of lessons learned during the sterile environment beta tests, modifications were made to the course. Phase II beta tests will extend into the remaining FY14 classes. These classes will allow students to complete the foundational DL course (Course 14, version 6) during their resident attendance. Starting with class 15A on October 14, we believe there will be enough students completing the Course 14v6 DL course to sustain the 26-day resident course. If there are insufficient Course 14 v6 graduates to support the follow-on residence piece of the blended course design, we are currently approved to facilitate the 33-day beta test class schedule through FY18. An update will be provided during the Nov 14 BOV. [**Recommended Action: MONITOR**]

Recommendation 11-2013-05: Recommend AU conducts an annual event to host a public lecturer. AU requires interaction with civilian agencies to add to the quality of this institution. This event would provide a venue for faculty development while continuing to build the AU brand.

AU Response: Concur. We will provide an executive summary detailing status / recommendation at the November 2014 board meeting. [**Recommended Action: OPEN**]

Recommendation 11-2013-06: Recommend AU maintains quality as the highest priority even if this means a smaller university is required.

AU Response: Concur. As we move forward to the Fifth-Year Interim Review (FYIR) quality remains at the forefront. We will provide an executive summary detailing progress at the November 2014 board meeting. [**Recommended Action: OPEN**]

Recommendation 11-2013-07: The Board recommended candidacy status for the 49th Operations Group.

AU Response: Concur. [**Recommended Action: CLOSED**]

Recommendation 11-2013-08: The Board recommended candidacy status for the 436th Operations Support Squadron.

AU Response: Concur. [**Recommended Action: CLOSED**]

Recommendation 11-2013-09: The Board recommended disaffiliation status for the 118th Operations Group.

AU Response: Concur. [**Recommended Action: CLOSED**]

Recommendation 11-2013-10: The Board recommended cancellation of affiliation in lieu of realignment for the Combat Readiness Training Center.

AU Response: Concur. [**Recommended Action: CLOSED**]

Recommendation 11-2013-11: Develop a strategy that justifies the value that AFIT degreed officers provide to the needs of the Air Force. Going beyond an AFIT-told story, attempt to gather testimonials from sponsors who have benefitted from AFIT graduates. Use the resulting strategy to proactively communicate to Air Force senior leaders the absolute necessity of retaining the AFIT graduate programs as essential to the intellectual needs of the future AF.

AU Response: Concur. AFIT's Institutional Advancement (IA) team is working to develop various marketing initiatives designed to increase awareness of AFIT, its value to the DOD, and its research-focused educational mission. These initiatives include lay articles, videos, an updated mission brief, and outreach to local organizations. To augment these activities, the IA committee created a list of 15 alumni whose professional achievements provide the most compelling evidence of AFIT's impact and contribution. Each of the alumni received a personalized letter from the Chancellor inviting them to help us improve our promotional materials and advocacy efforts by sharing their thoughts on how AFIT impacted their professional career. Of the 15 contacted, the IA team interviewed 3 alumni to date: Lieutenant General Andrew E. Busch (AFMC/CV), Dr. Gary A. O'Connell (NASIC/CA), and Dr. Vincent J. Russo (former Executive Director of the Aeronautical Systems Center). The article on Gen Busch was included in the 2013 Graduate School Annual Report highlighting his statement that "AFIT delivers really critical skills for the AF. My opinion on that is unchanged from when I was a student at AFIT, to now as a Lieutenant General as I watch the volume of young men and women who go through AFIT today." The efforts of the committee to collect and publicize these types of testimonials, to include research sponsors, will continue to be a priority.

[Recommended Action: MONITOR]

Recommendation 11-2013-12: Use the AFIT value proposition to influence, through AU, AETC, and the SECAF, a broad review of the AFERB process with the objectives of better identifying Air Force technical degree requirements and more fully utilizing AFIT's capacity to satisfy those requirements. In parallel, as part of its strategic planning process, AFIT should reevaluate and, where appropriate, reshape its current degree programs for cost effectiveness (i.e., better utilization of existing capacity), as well as project future degree needs of likely interest to the Air Force which could impact AFIT's overall technical degree-granting capacity.

AU Response: Concur. As an outcome of the on-going Program Objective Memorandum (POM) development process, Headquarters Air Force (HAF), Deputy Chief of Staff, Manpower and Personnel Directorate of Airman Development (A1D) and HQ AETC are reviewing how the AF establishes, validates and prioritizes its graduate education requirements thru the AFERB process. A comprehensive analysis of capacity vs. demand has been directed for each graduate degree program offered by AFIT's Graduates of Engineering and Management. **[Recommended Action: OPEN]**

Recommendation 11-2013-13: AFIT should begin the strategic planning process immediately, rather than waiting until a deputy director and vice chancellor is hired to begin the process in earnest. Although the HLC's focus was on the graduate education component of AFIT, the strategic plan should address AFIT in its entirety, including the professional continuing education components.

AU Response: Concur. The Chancellor has initiated a focused effort to develop and implement an institute-wide strategic planning process. The goal of the new process is to make systematic progress and continuous improvement toward AFIT's enterprise-wide vision, by accomplishing strategic goals through actionable objectives. The effort is on track to meet the HLC timeline, and is simultaneously executing three elements:

1. Update/develop AFIT "Strategic Guidance" and associated "Action Plan" documents.
2. Create/publish an AFIT Strategy Management Process Instruction with roles and responsibilities.
3. Configure an online Strategy Management Dashboard function to provide current progress information and allow informed decision making by all levels of AFIT leadership.

[Recommended Action: OPEN]

Recommendation 11-2013-14: In addition to its current end-of-course surveys, AFIT should begin conducting longitudinal assessments of its programs (both graduate and continuing education) at intervals such as 1, 3 and 5 years to determine the value to its stakeholders including students, short term customers (i.e., agencies requiring certain degree programs and/or short courses), and long term customers (i.e., commands that benefit from post graduate and continuing education but do not sponsor such programs).

AU Response: Concur. Longitudinal assessments against well-documented outcomes for each program are currently accomplished through the Department of Academic Affairs (ENW). ENW is building and maintaining an email data base of AFIT graduates which can be used to facilitate surveys of graduates. Departments periodically perform external reviews, as do the research centers, and are responsive to their stakeholders. Additionally, longitudinal reviews also occur in some graduate school departments. The Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering (ENG) conducts annual program reviews that contain longitudinal reviews across graduating classes. For example, Cyber 200/300 accomplished a detailed review via the center's Distinguished Review Board and, as a result of the feedback; the course was revised in the summer 2013 to address the issues that were raised. In the School of Systems and Logistics, post course surveys are conducted with graduates and their supervisors six months after graduation.

This survey is conducted on at least one offering of each course per year. In addition, a program review of curriculum on all of our courses is completed with our sponsors and functional leads. Survey data from the last three years on each course is reviewed and discussed. A thorough course review (every lesson objective, survey data, all class presentation data, etc.) is completed every three years with the course sponsor.

Note: Most of these courses are of very short duration. Distance Learning courses average between 10-15 hours of instruction. Live/blended courses average 2.5-3 class days. To conduct longitudinal assessment of short courses 3-5 years after student completes course is problematic. Assessing impacts of a 2-day course taken 5 years ago is almost impossible to measure.

In the Civil Engineer School, one survey offering per course at the six month interval is surveyed. The most recent manpower cuts to the registrar and educational technicians make continued and increased surveying difficult with the reduced support staff. The school will relook the survey program and determine the optimal surveying interval to best assess value to stakeholders. [**Recommended Action: MONITOR**]

Recommendation 11-2013-15: AFIT should identify various opportunities for non-appropriated revenue along with any legislative, policy, or regulatory constraints that are currently keeping it from capitalizing fully on those opportunities, and forward to AU and above for resolution where possible.

AU Response: Concur. In November 2012, AFIT submitted a Unified Legislation and Budgeting (ULB) proposal to amend AFIT's Title X authority (TITLE 10, Chapter 901, Part III, Sec 9314(e)) regarding the retention and use of tuition funds. The purpose of the amended law is to provide explicit language that allows AFIT to retain and utilize tuition collections from individuals authorized to enroll in AFIT's degree and continuing education programs who wish to utilize tuition assistance, education benefits from the Department of Veterans Affairs, self-pay means, and scholarship/fellowship programs. The amended law will provide DoD and other Government employees with flexibility in funding their graduate or continuing education programs and it will give AFIT the ability to recover the incremental costs associated with educating these additional students. This initiative would be effective in FY16. In addition, AFIT has received authority (and now Secretary of the Air Force approval) to enroll defense industry employees in graduate and continuing education programs. This authority allows AFIT to retain tuition from these students. In light of this, AFIT has made efforts to reach out to this demographic, including: Open house events at AFIT, attendance at graduate fairs on base at Wright State University and neighboring educational institutions, social networking sites such as LinkedIn and Facebook, email and phone recruitment from an established database that is ever evolving, and face to face meetings with various contracting firms. AFIT currently has the authority to obtain non-appropriated revenue via Cooperative Research and Development Agreements (CRADAs) and grants for research and educational purposes. Tuition revenues could be further enhanced if: (1) Broader authority to enroll non-government degree-seeking students is obtained via legislative initiative (removed from AFIT's initial submission during previous legislative process); and/or (2) A legal mechanism for student over-hires is identified (AFIT/JA reviewing); and/or (3) A legal mechanism for providing tuition funding for defense contractor students who are participating in AFIT's reimbursable research projects (AFIT/JA reviewing). [**Recommended Action: OPEN**]

Recommendation 11-2013-16: AFIT should develop a strategic communications plan which integrates and ties together the various institutional advancement components, thus providing a framework for determining the message for each target audience, identifying the best communications vehicles for delivering those messages, delineating who will deliver that message and at what frequency (with a goal of using AFIT stakeholders as much as possible), and measuring outcomes. Concurrently, AFIT should establish a robust two-way communications process with AU's institutional advancement focal point to enable AU to integrate AFIT's IA activities into the overall AU IA effort, as well as to assure AU branding is incorporated where appropriate into AFIT's IA initiative.

AU Response: Concur. AFIT's Institutional Advancement (IA) Strategy was finalized in May 2013. The purpose is to provide a common framework for coordinating and focusing the diverse communication needs that exist within our institute, along with numerous marketing opportunities, to create a fully integrated, defense-focused, collective AFIT image/message. The IA Strategy Subcommittee met on 18 Sept 13 for a periodic review of the document. Action items from that meeting included providing details on AFIT's cost effectiveness and affordability, reviewing the objectives and target audience sections to ensure the three schools are adequately represented, and updating the matrix of high visibility activities. The entire IA committee is working to develop various marketing initiatives designed to increase awareness of AFIT and its professional continuing education, and research-focused graduate education missions. These initiatives include lay articles, improved marketing templates, videos, an updated mission brief, brochures, a process for approving messages for external audiences, and outreach to local organizations. The main project for the institute is updating and re-vitalizing the AFIT website. The new design vastly improves the user's interface and ability to quickly and easily find information. Great effort has been expended to increase the use of photos and videos to tell our story as opposed to long paragraphs of text. The redesigned website is planned to launch spring of 2014. The team created an AFIT Equation Sheet that will be available to students at USAFA and other undergraduate schools to help increase awareness of AFIT. A new tour construct has been developed to address key elements including: clearly and consistently conveying the AFIT message to visitors, avoiding overuse of select labs and staff, and developing content that meets the audience's technical knowledge. Monthly presentations have been instated to ensure all faculty and staff are aware of processes and initiatives. The presentations are also used to share noteworthy faculty and research highlights. The IA team has developed a spreadsheet to track AFIT marketing initiatives with the goal of using the data for benchmarking analysis. In December 2013, the team met to discuss plans for the New Year. Several projects were identified including defining metrics to measure the success of our marketing objectives, and developing marketing materials specifically for senior leaders.
[Recommended Action: MONITOR]

Recommendation 11-2012-13: Recommend AU reviews 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.

AU Response: Concur. A study was conducted revealing AFROTC is the primary source of commission for accessing officers into technical Air Force Specialty Codes (AFSC) and AFROTC is projected to fill 72% of the technical billets in FY15. AFROTC is aware and indeed

proud of its role to produce the majority of technical AFSCs for AF accessions and has developed rigorous, methodical scholarship and advancement selection programs to meet AF accession goals. **[Recommended Action: CLOSED]**

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.

AU Response: Concur. AU employs a deliberately designed, decentralized system to assess academic effectiveness. Center or school program assessment staff adhere to a standardized process defined by HQ AU/CF in both AUI 36-2312, Air University Assessment Programs, and 36-2606, Air University Academic Corporate Process, that functions extremely well. Each organization's activities are directed solely at their own programs. Assessment results are reported to the university's office of Institutional Effectiveness annually where they are analyzed, consolidated and incorporated into a State of the University report. Neither duplication nor redundancy in program assessment nor institutional effectiveness activities exists in the schools, centers or university level. Despite these initiatives, university leaders recognize that the redundant registrar systems remain an impediment; the numerous systems represent potential risks. A3/6 and CFR are working to consolidate the various systems. **[Recommended Action: MONITOR]**

Recommendation 11-2011-20: The Board approved the revised Squadron Officer School program, but remains 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. In August 2013, CSAF directed AU to develop a plan that would allow 100% resident attendance for Active Duty, with no blended learning option, and AU has forwarded a proposal for a 5-week SOC course that meets these guidelines. The Air Staff is currently revising SOC eligibility policy so that DL will only be allowed for captains who are unable to attend in residence, thereby eliminating whatever confusion there might be in the field about the need or value of completing SOC by both methods. **[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: Since 2010 and on a limited basis, AU schools have accessed a .com environment via the Defense Research and Engineering Network (DREN) Outreach services. Due to discontinuance of funding and bandwidth limitations this capability was deactivated on 30 September 2013. AU has implemented a pilot test of a wireless broadband 4G LTE cellular capability utilizing routers (MiFi devices) to provide commercial access in mission critical areas which previously relied on DREN. Implementation of these devices is a stop gap solution as AU continues to pursue a Global Information Grid waiver for commercial services, and studies the options and feasibility of a phased approach to providing AU-wide commercial access. Through these efforts, AU will be postured to implement commercial services, so if funding is available in FY14 or beyond, the University can immediately execute contractual documents to implement a commercial service. Concurrently, three objectives in the AETC 2012 Transformation Map are to instill a cost conscious culture, transform learning, and value airmen's time. In keeping with AETC's Vision for Learning Transformation and the First Principles of Learning, AETC understood the importance of an environment truly supportive of learning anytime and anywhere. As part of the AETC Transformation Council the AETC Chief Learning Officer chartered a command-wide EDUNET working group to examine the requirements and plan for a platform which would support the unique needs of education and training. To date, A3/6 continues investigating and working the waiver request to ensure a permanent solution is in place. **[Recommended Action: OPEN]**

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

AU Response: Concur. AU has developed and enacted several approaches to employing technology to handle expanded enrollment and distance education for the full enterprise. We have created an Education Support Working Group (ESWG) which provides a venue to identify, analyze, report, and promote transformative educational technology opportunities and improvements to current and future learning activities within AU. The ESWG focuses on viable, sustainable technologies, supporting academic systems and the infrastructure needed to meet the needs of our twenty-first century learners. The ESWG provides a truly collaborative environment for connecting requirements, activities, and resources in pursuit of AU strategic plans and priorities for the effective implementation of essential learning technology. Moreover, there has been an overhaul of several internal cradle-to-grave processes sustaining information systems to meet the mission challenges in a cost-conscious environment. AU now employs a more robust, requirements-based approach to managing the software configuration lifecycle process (SCLP) with the integration of portfolio, program, and project management as key components. The goal of the SCLP is to focus limited resources (capability and capacity) on prioritized mission requirements in a transparent manner. The SCLP implements new processes that analyze software change requests and best prioritize these requests based on several factors to include mission criticality and available resources (time, material, and manpower). With the establishment of the recently created Education Operations and Communications Directorate, the formation of the ESWG, and the newly enacted SCLP, AU is positioned to handle expanded enrollment and distance education for the full enterprise. **[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. A briefing was provided during the November 2013 meeting and an update will be briefed next fall BOV to ensure the QEP process is entwined with Institutional Effectiveness. All programs will continue to work towards the goals established in the QEP with an update briefing at the fall 2014 BOV Meeting. [**Recommended Action: MONITOR**]

Section VI: AFIT Subcommittee Meeting Minutes

Air University (AU) Board of Visitors (BOV)
47th Air Force Institute of Technology (AFIT)
Subcommittee Meeting Minutes
10-11 March 2014
AFIT Chancellor's Conference Room
Wright-Patterson AFB, OH

Section I: Subcommittee Meeting Attendance

A. Members of the Subcommittee attending the meeting:

- (1) Maj Gen Richard Paul, USAF, Ret (Subcommittee Chair)
- (2) Maj Gen Ron Sega, Ph.D., USAF, Ret
- (3) Lt Gen Mark Shackelford, USAF, Ret
- (4) Dr. Rayford Vaughn, Ph.D., VP for Research, The University of AL in Huntsville, Col, USA, Ret
- (5) Dr. Mary Cummings, Ph.D., Associate Professor, Duke University (via teleconference)

B. Members of the Subcommittee absent:

- (1) Mr. Henry Fong
- (2) VADM Ronald Route, USN, Ret

C. Other attendees at the meeting:

- | | |
|-----------------------------|---------------------------|
| (1) Lt Gen Steven Kwast | (15) Dr. David Bunker |
| (2) Dr. Todd I. Stewart | (16) Ms. Amber Richy |
| (3) Dr. Chris Cain | (17) Dr. Steven Fiorino |
| (4) Col Timothy J. Lawrence | (18) Mr. Jack Blackhurst |
| (5) Col Paul Cotellesso | (19) Dr. Paul Wolf |
| (6) Mr. Rick Wojick | (20) Mr. Michael Ausseler |
| (7) Dr. Heidi Ries | (21) Dr. Adedeji Badiru |
| (8) Col Tay Johannes | (22) Mr. Bob Helt |
| (9) Lt Col Timothy Sands | (23) CMSgt Timothy Horn |
| (10) Maj Brian Woolley | (24) Mrs. Diana Bunch |
| (11) Dr. Darryl Ahner | (25) Ms. Lisa Arnold |
| (12) Dr. Robert Mills | |
| (13) Dr. Jonathan Black | |
| (14) Lt Col Darin Ladd | |

Section II: Subcommittee Discussions

A. Maj Gen (ret) Dick Paul called the meeting to order and welcomed all attendees via roundtable introductions of the Subcommittee members and the AFIT leadership in attendance. General (ret) Paul stated this was a public meeting and Mrs. Diana Bunch, AU Designated Federal Officer, was present throughout the meeting.

B. Dr. Todd Stewart provided an overview of Wright-Patterson AFB organizations and the AFIT mission. He discussed chain of command, staff turn-over and changes, and the challenges and opportunities facing AFIT with respect to; personnel, marketing, and communication. Dr. Stewart also discussed the National Research Commission and Ms. Amber Richy provided an overview of AFIT's resources and discussed budgetary restrictions. Lt Col Brett Gooden, Col Jeff White, and Dr. Vera McKethan provided a briefing on the Air Force Education Requirements Board (AFERB) process via VTC. After a productive interactive lunch with faculty, the day's briefings continued with the Higher Learning Commission, Information Technology, and Strategic Partnership discussions.

On Tuesday, 11 March 2014, the Subcommittee was provided an opportunity to discuss with key AFIT leaders, the state of the following AFIT schools and centers:

- Graduate School of Engineering and Management
- The Civil Engineer School
- School of Systems and Logistics
- Advanced Navigation Technology Center
- Center for Cyberspace Research and the AF Cyberspace Technical Center of Excellence
- Center for Directed Energy
- Center for Operational Analysis
- Scientific Test and Analysis Techniques Test & Evaluation Center of Excellence
- Center for Technical Intelligence Studies and Research
- Center for Space Research and Assurance

After a productive and interactive lunch with students, Tuesday afternoon concluded with a discussion of Institutional Advancement Initiatives and AFIT's Strategic plan.

C. The Subcommittee members met with leaders of the various AFIT departments regarding the policies and programs throughout AFIT and have listed the Subcommittee's requests, observations, and recommendations in Section III of these minutes. These recommendations will be presented to the AU Board of Visitors at the next scheduled committee meeting.

D. The next Subcommittee meeting is scheduled for 9-10 March, 2015 at AFIT in Dayton, OH.

Section III: Subcommittee Requests, Observations, and Recommendations

A. POM Formulation

Background: Advanced education falls under the AETC Core Function Lead Integrator (CFLI) for Program Objective Memorandum (POM) deliberations. It appears that, in some cases, the AETC corporate structure is addressing future funding reductions without a full understanding of the impacts of these reductions on organizations that benefit from AFIT graduates or on non-STEM degree-related SECAF directives.

Recommendation: AETC Corporate Structure leadership include AFIT and AU Leadership in the conversation on potential funding reductions during CFLI POM deliberations. AFIT and AU can inform decision makers of the consequences of possible programming actions on Advanced Education to insure the smartest possible decisions for the Air Force.

B. Accreditation Follow-up

Background: The Higher Learning Commission (HLC) of the North Central Association of Schools and Colleges visited AFIT in 2010 and reaffirmed its accreditation in May 2011 for ten more years. Four concerns were identified that remain unresolved. An AFIT progress report submitted in Dec 2012 received a negative response from the HLC, with directions for a monitoring report due in July 2014. The Subcommittee learned that while some issues will soon be resolved, others require HLC to provide additional clarity or to re-examine the original issue for AFIT to reach resolution. The Subcommittee is concerned that a continuation of unresolved concerns could eventually negatively impact AFIT's accreditation status or, at a minimum, its academic reputation.

Recommendation: AFIT place a high priority on establishing a face-to-face relationship with the HLC liaison (underway by Dr. Stewart) and continue working aggressively and proactively with HLC to resolve the remaining issues as quickly as possible. The Subcommittee further recommends that periodic reporting of progress toward resolution be provided to AU and shared with Subcommittee members.

C. Alternative Business Models

Background: AFIT is examining alternative "business models" to the traditional student model (e.g., 2 to 3 year full-time program with thesis/dissertation for MS and PhD degrees) in the interest of being relevant to a larger segment of the Air Force customer base and generating additional non-appropriated revenue. Such non-traditional alternatives might include tailored PhD programs and 12-month MS degrees without a thesis for part-time students from Wright-Patterson AFB.

Recommendation: The Subcommittee applauds the innovative thinking behind these alternatives as AFIT considers its strategy going forward in the current and expected fiscal environments, and encourages continued examination of such alternatives along with identifying implications

for various alternatives in terms of policy, faculty incentives, etc., consistent with AFIT's core mission and existing/projected capacity.

D. Strategic Partnerships

Background: AFRL briefed the Subcommittee on its strategic partnership with AFIT, codified by a Strategic Partnership MOA updated in March 2012. AFRL provides approximately \$5M annually for sponsored research, and there are numerous initiatives involving shared facilities, identification of research topics and sponsors/advisors for thesis/dissertation work by AFIT students, and people initiatives such as AFRL adjunct professors and personnel exchanges between the two organizations. The partnership activities are regularly reviewed at the senior leadership levels of both AFRL and AFIT.

Recommendation: The Subcommittee applauds the initiative of AFIT and AFRL in implementing the current arrangement, and encourages the leadership of AFIT to pursue its current plan of working with AFRL leadership to take the partnership to a more strategic level via joint, integrated planning in such areas as technology and research, workforce needs, and infrastructure. Alternative graduate programs for AFRL personnel as discussed in the preceding recommendation appear consistent with a more strategic level partnership.

E. Faculty Morale

Background: Subcommittee members conducted a faculty feedback session, during which multiple faculty members indicated morale was at a low point driven in large part by ongoing travel restrictions to non-government conferences and absence of salary increases for promotion steps. The Subcommittee is aware of measures underway to accelerate the travel restriction approval process, as well as recent remedies enacted for paying faculty for promotion steps. However, the faculty seemed unaware of these mitigating steps during our discussions and continue to experience extreme frustration with highly constrained travel.

Recommendation: AFIT leaders update the faculty on these various mitigating measures on a regular and continuing basis until the measures are fully implemented and the level of faculty awareness has increased.

F. AFIT Research Centers

Background: The Subcommittee received overview briefings on the various research centers operating at AFIT. These research centers account for the majority of the external funding being received by AFIT, report to applicable AFIT Graduate Engineering & Management School academic departments (vice the Dean of Research) to maintain AFIT's educational focus, are cross-disciplinary in their composition (i.e., involve multiple academic departments), and are highly collaborative with outside agencies (government, academia, and industry) in the conduct of their research. Graduate students at both the MS and PhD level are heavily engaged in the research, thus directly supporting AFIT's mission of research-driven education, and are typically working real-world problems identified by the sponsors of the research. Student feedback

indicated that the research centers provided a synergistic environment for accomplishing the research component of their education and contributed substantially to their academic progress.

Observation: The Subcommittee applauds the work being accomplished by AFIT's research centers and the student engagement that is taking place within them, and observes that the research centers are wholly consistent with AFIT's research-driven educational mission and very effective in attracting and conducting cross-disciplinary research of direct interest to sponsoring agencies within the US defense establishment.

G. Agenda Request

Request: While the Subcommittee received a series of excellent overviews on each of the individual research centers at the March 2014 meeting, we request time be set aside at the next meeting regarding how research is managed in general at AFIT; to include the management philosophy and organizational construct of the research centers as a group, how student engagement takes place, how oversight is maintained to assure that the AFIT mission remains education-centric (supported by research) vs. research-centric, external funding sources and amounts for all research (centers and non-centers), proposal support processes at AFIT both pre- and post-award, etc.



RICHARD PAUL, Major General, USAF, Retired
Chair, AFIT Subcommittee
8 April 2014

Section VII: AU Response to AFIT Subcommittee Recommendation:

Background: Advanced education falls under the AETC Core Function Lead Integrator (CFLI) for Program Objective Memorandum (POM) deliberations. It appears that, in some cases, the AETC corporate structure is addressing future funding reductions without a full understanding of the impacts of these reductions on organizations that benefit from AFIT graduates or on non-STEM degree-related SECAF directives.

Recommendation: AETC Corporate Structure leadership include AFIT and AU Leadership in the conversation on potential funding reductions during CFLI POM deliberations. AFIT and AU can inform decision makers of the consequences of possible programming actions on Advanced Education to insure the smartest possible decisions for the Air Force.

AU/FMAP & AU/CFRS Response: The subcommittee's observation regarding advance academic education (AAD) falling under the AETC CFLI for POM deliberations is accurate, but incomplete. Whereas AETC as the CFLI is responsible for executing AAD programs through AFIT's School of Engineering (AFIT/EN) and its Civilian Institution (AFIT/CI) program, AETC (nor AFIT) is not responsible for generating or prioritizing AF FYDP AAD requirements. Per AFI 36-2301, Chapter 1, AF/A1D will adjudicate the submitted the AF functional area AAD requirements through the AF Education Requirements Board (AFERB) based on CSAF priorities and available resources.

Addressing the FY15 POM 20% reduction to AF graduation education opportunity: The subcommittee's statement the AETC corporate structure is, "addressing future funding reductions without a full understanding of the impacts of these reductions," is again based on incomplete data either not provided to, or (through no fault of their own) ask for by the subcommittee.

Initially proposed in June 2013 during the FY15 POM 4-Star Strategic Trades sessions after General Welsh rejected the full "Terminate AFIT" option, AETC/A8P working directly with the AF Corporate Structure including A1X-P&T, and the AU A5/8P, CFRS, and FM staff agencies developed a proposal that would reduce, "O&M, Student Manyears (SMYs) and associated staff over 3-year phased in period commensurate with reducing Grad Ed opportunity by Flight following Force Structure / functional Grad Ed requirements." The rationale: FY15 AF active duty end-strength is being reduced to approx. 311K; ergo, the AF can reasonably see similar reductions in AAD requirements. The proposal was specifically designed not target any single AAD program, but rather force the AF functionals to scrub all their individual Grad Ed requirements (note: the title of the offset is, "Reduce AF Grad Ed Opportunity", not "Reduce AFIT 20%."

All individuals directly working on the proposal were required to sign and comply with Non-Disclosure Agreements. Data provided to AETC/A8P by AU/A5/8P, FM, and CFR included: extensive program summaries and student production data (provided from AFIT at the start of the POM cycle); AFIT's contributions to the AF (taken directly from a April 2013 email from Dr. Stewart to then AETC/A8 BGen Vander Hamm); a 10+ year historical examination of AFERB AAD data; a current list of all graduate programs (regular, UMD-specific, faculty

development, special degrees, Olmsted & CSAF scholars, advanced studies group, special non-degree, Education-with-Industry, etc); FYDP resource data (funding, manpower, & SMYs); and cost analysis of various reduction scenarios. Through the course of several teleconferences between AU, AETC (including one with AF/A1D), impact statements (including second and third order effects) were skillfully prepared and then presented by AETC/A8P to the AF Corporate Structure for its decision and ultimate acceptance of the offset. Both the AETC/CC and AU/CC were fully aware of the offset being briefed at the Strategic Trades Session.

The final funding offset figures:

- SMY redux lay-in schedule: FY15: -124; FY16: -320; FY17: -484 (new total of 864)
- O&M reduction: FY15: -\$2.4M; FY16: -\$6.2M; FY17: -\$6.8M; FY18: -\$6.9M; FY19: -\$7.0M

What's Happened Since Then: The AF Corp Structure initially laid a majority of the funding reductions against CI tuition funding. AU & AETC/A8 have already internally corrected this for FY16 through a better balanced distribution of the program element which funds all AF graduate and other professional continuing education. Additionally, AF/A1DL has developed a new proposed prioritized AFERB AAD list with projected AFIT CI quotas requirements while still remaining within the new SMY and CI tuition funding constraints. This new list (along with all functional STEM and non-STEM degree-related SECAF directives) will be debated and prioritized at the next AFERB (tentatively scheduled for Oct 2014).

Summary:

- (1) Per AFI 36-2301, AF/A1D chairs and adjudicates the AFERB AAD requirements (determined by AF functional input, CSAF / SECAF priorities, and resourcing limitations).
- (2) AFIT through its School of Engineering or Civilian Institution program will execute those AFERB-approved quotas.
- (3) AETC/A8 developed the FY15 POM "Reduce AF Grad Ed Opportunity" offset at the direction of the CSAF and AF Corporate Structure, and with extensive input from AU/A5/8P, FM, and CFR, AF/ A1X-P&T, and basic POM data provided each year to AU from AFIT. Both AETC/CC and AU/CC were aware of the proposed offset.
- (4) The AF Corporate Structure was willing to accept the higher risk posed by this offset.