

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

15 -18 November 2009 / 0800 – 1700
Open Meeting
Air University Commander's Conference Room
Building 836
Maxwell Air Force Base, Alabama 36112



- 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

Attachments:
Undergraduate Education Subcommittee Meeting Minutes
Honorary Degree Subcommittee Meeting Minutes
Ad Hoc Committee for Board Structure

Section I: Board Attendance

A. Board Members attending the meeting:

1. Dr. James Anderson, Col, USAF, Ret
2. Mr. Norman Augustine
3. Rev William Beauchamp
4. Mrs. Mary Boies
5. Adm Vern Clark, USN, Ret
6. Maj Gen Stephen Condon, USAF, Ret
7. Ambassador Gary Cooper, Maj Gen, USMC, Ret
8. Dr. Don Daniel
9. Mr. Henry Fong
10. Dr. Stephen Fritz
11. Gen Patrick Gamble, USAF, Ret
12. Dr. Tito Guerrero
13. Dr. Jack Hawkins
14. Dr. E. Jan Kehoe
15. Dr. Benjamin Lambeth
16. Dr. Joe Lee
17. CMSgt Karl Meyers, USAF, Ret
18. Dr. Ann Millner
19. CMSAF Gerald Murray, USAF, Ret
20. Vice Adm Daniel Oliver, USN, Ret
21. Maj Gen Richard Paul, USAF, Ret
22. Brig Gen Clifton Poole, USA, Ret
23. Maj Gen Ronald Sega, USAF, Ret
24. Dr. William Segura
25. Dr. Eugene Spafford

B. Members of the AU BOV absent:

1. Dr. Susan Aldridge
2. Dr. Terry Alfriend
3. Gen Charles Boyd, USAF, Ret
4. Dr. David Carter
5. Mr. Mel Chaskin
6. Dr. Mildred Garcia
7. Dr. Muriel Howard
8. Dr. John Luke, Lt Col, USAF, Ret

C. Air University and other personnel attending the meeting:

1. General Stephen Lorenz, AETC/CC
2. Lt Gen Allen Peck, AU/CC
3. Maj Gen Maurice Forsyth, Spaatz Center/CC
4. Maj Gen Stephen Miller, AETC/CV
5. Dr. Bruce Murphy, AU/CF
6. Brig Gen Teresa Djuric, Holm Center/CC
7. Brig Gen Anthony Rock, Spaatz Center/CV
8. Brig Gen Walter Givhan, AFIT/CC
9. Col Charles Johnson, Barnes Center/CC
10. CMSgt Byre McMillon, AU/CCC
11. Dr. Dorothy Reed, AU/CFA
12. Lt Col Timothy Albrecht, CCAF/CC
13. Mrs. Diana Bunch, AU/CFA
14. Dr. Hank Dasinger, Barnes Center
15. Dr. Dale Hayden, AFRI
16. Dr. James Larkins, CCAF
17. Dr. Richard Lester, Eaker Center
18. Dr. Susanne Logan, Spaatz Center
19. Dr. Charles Nath, Holm Center
20. Dr. Phil Chansler, AFSSO21
21. LT Stephanie Brown, NPS

Section II: Board Activities and Discussions

A. The AU BOV meeting convened at 0800 on 16 November 2009 in the Air University Commander's Conference Room at Maxwell Air Force Base, Alabama. Dr. Tito Guerrero chaired the meeting and welcomed the Board members. In addition, Dr. Guerrero and Lt Gen Allen Peck presented a new Board member certificate to Mr. Henry Fong.

B. Dr. Guerrero informed the Board members that this formal meeting was open to the public and was advertised in the Federal Register on 20 October 2009. In addition, Dr. Dorothy Reed and Mrs. Diana Bunch, Designated Federal Officers for the Board, were present during the meeting and a quorum was met.

C. After introductions and meeting overview, Dr. Guerrero relinquished the floor to Lt Gen Allen Peck, Commander of Air University, for his State of the University address.

1. General Peck welcomed the Board and introduced General Stephen Lorenz, Commander of Air Education and Training Command (AETC). General Peck requested General Lorenz discuss with the Board the latest issues facing AETC and the Air Force.

2. General Lorenz' discussion included an overview of the following topics:

(a) AF and AETC funding: FY08 through FY11 budget data for people, readiness, infrastructure, and modernization was briefed. AETC Operations and Maintenance (O&M) budget for FY09 was \$2.6B and is expected to increase to \$2.8B by FY11. Air University's O&M budget for FY09 was \$455M and is expected to increase to \$482M by FY11.

(b) Remotely Piloted Aircraft: The demand for Remotely Piloted Aircraft (RPA) has accelerated over the years and the Air Force will gain 320 unmanned aircraft in the next 5 years. General Norton Schwartz, the Air Force Chief of Staff, was quoted stating, "given technological leaps forward, it's not hard to imagine a multitude of other missions for our unmanned aircraft, including air transport, air refueling, suppressing enemy air defenses, forward air control, combat search and rescue, and more."

(c) Cyber: General Lorenz briefed that in 1995 there was an estimated 16 million users of the web and today it is estimated 1.7 billion users "surf" the web and by 2014, the Internet is projected to be four times bigger than it is today. The Air Force Space Command was designated as the lead command for cyberspace and established the 24th Air Force at Lackland Air Force Base. The Air Force now teaches cyber safety training and information assurance during Basic Military Training. Cyberspace training is also part officer and enlisted force development.

(d) Developing Cross-Domain Warriors: General Lorenz briefed that the traditional definition of an Air Force operator doesn't fit today's operational-level realities and that joint/interagency warfighters require Airmen who can integrate air/space/cyber capabilities at the operational level of war. The Air Force is reviewing a proposal to include an intermediate developmental education-level education and training that awards a Master's Degree in Cross Domain Operational-Level Warfare and Joint Professional Military Education credit. This

program would include a 24-month follow-on cross-domain assignment that provides hands-on experience in specially designated positions outside an officer's core domain.

(e) Air Force Research Institute (AFRI): The AFRI mission is to conduct independent research, outreach, and engagement to enhance national security and assure the effectiveness of the US Air Force. Homeland Defense and the Air National Guard (ANG), Future Learning, and the USAF Infrastructure and Basing are several examples of AFRI's research projects.

(f) General Lorenz closed his discussions by stating that the "Board's support of Air University programs is making Air Force-wide impact."

3. General Peck discussed the following issues with the Board:

(a) National Security Space Institute (NSSI): In October 2009, NSSI was realigned to Air University (under the Eaker Center) to help institutionalize space into AF education programs. The NSSI offers potential for significant synergies between space professional continuing education, space professional military education, and space research activities for the AF.

(b) Academy of Military Science (AMS) Integration: AMS transitioned from McGhee Tyson ANGB, TN in October 2009 to consolidate officer commissioning training programs to the Officer Training School at Maxwell AFB. This integration will provide a shared common commissioning experience for the total force.

(c) Civilian Acculturation and Leadership Training (CALT): The CALT program provides new Department of the Air Force civilian employees with developmental opportunities similar to those afforded AF officer/enlisted personnel. The 2-week resident program is designed to prepare selected AF civilian employees for future leadership and supervisory roles. AU is funded in FY10 to conduct eight classes of 40 students each.

(d) Diversity: General Peck provided data for the various accession programs, as well as several of the resident programs at Maxwell AFB. The "Gold Bar" Recruiting Program focuses on minority recruiting by assigning commissioned 2d lieutenants as recruiters for up to 12 months. These recruiters are located near high-density population centers and target highly qualified minority high school graduates. Eighteen recruiters have made over 2,000 contacts so far this year. General Peck also discussed ROTC's High School Scholarship Program (HSSP). While not a minority recruiting program, HSSP minority data was covered.

(e) General Peck also provided an update on the Air and Space Basic Course, On-line Masters' Program (OLMP), the expansion of the School of Advance Air and Space Studies (SAASS), and the Cyberspace Operations Executive Course.

4. Dr. Bruce Murphy, AU Chief Academic Officer, presented the following updates to the Board:

(a) Accreditation: In March of this year, after extensive off-site review of documentation, the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Commission on Colleges (SACS) conducted an on-site visit to determine Air University compliance with the SACS

“Principles of Accreditation.” Dr. Murphy presented a timeline showing milestones and indicating that a final determination by SACS is expected in early December 2009.

(b) Federal Legislation: Air University has been working with the Department of Education on implementing language obtained in the 2009 National Defense Authorization Act. This legislation requires congressional notification of (1) any new programs or (2) any unsuccessful accreditation attempts. Reviews will be conducted by both regional accreditation teams (SACS) and the US Department of Education (National Advisory Committee on Institutional Quality and Integrity, NACIQI).

(c) Move from SACS Level III (offering Master’s degree) to Level V (offering Doctoral degrees): An Air University initiative calls for a PhD degree to be offered through the SAASS. AU is accredited by SACS to offer degrees only through the master’s level. In order to offer the PhD degree, Air University must request a level change including submitting a prospectus for SACS review and hosting a SACS visiting team to gain approval.

(d) AF-dot-Edu: Air University has begun to move from a “.mil” to a “.edu” environment for most of its information technology activities. The Board supports this migration, as appropriate, to the mission of AU and requests the status be again updated at the next Board meeting.

(e) Governance (Commander’s Title Change): General Norton Schwartz, AF Chief of Staff, as well as Air Education and Training Command (AETC), and the AF Legal Office have indicated approval to change the title of the AU Commander from "Commander" to "Commander and President." The AF Personnel Office has agreed to forward this information to AF General Officers Group to let them know this should be done upon Lt Gen Peck's departure, i.e., the next AU Change of Command, but not before. Locally, the personnel office will change the title on the position description after the confirmation to "Commander and President." The BOV recommended this change in April 2009.

(f) Honorary degree. General Peck conferred the Doctor of Science *Honoris Causa* degree upon Colonel (Ret) Frank Borman, “Dean of American Astronauts” at June 13th ceremonies at the USAF Test Pilot School, Edwards Air Force Base, California. The Board Subcommittee is reviewing the current nomination list for honorary doctorates and will provide a recommendation to the AU Commander during the April 2010 meeting.

5. The Board was honored to attend the Air Education and Training Command Educator of the Year awards luncheon. This highly competitive award recognizes individuals who have made significant contributions to AETC’s educational mission during the academic year.

6. Faculty Presentation. Dr. James Kiras and Dr. Jim Forsyth demonstrated polarities in the SAASS curriculum by discussing the “Cult of Counterinsurgency” and the “Future of Great Power War.” Both presenters were outstanding and the Board asked for such presentations to be included as part of every meeting. These presentations are helpful not only because of the interesting information and perspectives presented, but more importantly, they give the Board an opportunity to meet significant faculty and their work and expertise at the various AU schools.

D. Ad Hoc Committee Report: During the April 2009 Board meeting, Air University discussed the rationale for offering a terminal degree in Security Studies at SAASS. In order for the Board

to provide AU with advice and guidance on proceeding with the PhD degree program, the Board recommended AU provide the prospectus for review. The prospectus was sent to all the Board members to review prior to the meeting. The Board Chair appointed the following members to serve on the Ad Hoc Committee and charged this committee with conducting a thorough review of the prospectus:

Dr. Jan Kehoe (Committee Chair)	Admiral (Ret) Vern Clark	Dr. Joe Lee
General (Ret) Patrick Gamble	Dr. Ann Millner	Dr. Jack Hawkins
Mrs. Mary Boies		

After lengthy discussions, the Board recommended AU continue to move forward in developing application for Level V status within SACS and continue development of the curriculum for a SAASS PhD/doctoral degree with the purpose of meeting an Air Force need for advanced strategists.

Dr. Guerrero approved the continuance of the Ad Hoc Committee with the addition of Dr. Ben Lambeth as a member and General (Ret) Pat Gamble as the Ad Hoc Committee Chair. The Ad Hoc Committee is charged with the following:

- Review the progress of AU in developing the post-core curriculum components (experiential/assignments/advanced coursework) leading to the development of advanced strategists.
- Monitor/review the SACS and Department of Education applications and when standards are satisfied provide a recommendation to approve or disapprove to the AU BOV Chair for a final vote of the Board.

Further, the Board requests that thoughtful consideration be given to the selection process so the value of attending the SAASS core program not be diminished for selectees who are not pursuing the PhD/doctoral track and that the proposal be vetted with experts in the field, internally (AU) and externally (other institutions and organizations) as appropriate.

Finally, the AU BOV requests a report at the April meeting on progress made pursuant to the assignments curriculum issue.

E. Tuesday morning the Board received presentations and engaged in the following discussions concerning the university:

1. Spaatz Academic Centers: The Board was briefed on the background, mission, and objectives of the various academic centers available to support the university. Each of these centers focus their efforts on enduring or emerging education and research needs of the AF and serve as advocates for these needs. The Centers also support and fund education and research activities for students, faculty, and center staff. The Center for Strategy and Technology (CSAT) and the AF Culture and Language Center (AFCLC) were highlighted during these discussions. The Board had the following observations:

(a) Autonomous Systems: Over the years there has been a tendency to design attack aircraft, ordnance, and sensors (target acquisition) in relative isolation from one another—with

perhaps disproportionate emphasis on the aircraft. It is important that as we place greater emphasis on remotely piloted aircraft we avail ourselves of the opportunity to address them as systems—including the aircraft, sensors, ordnance, and communications.

(b) Responsive Threats: The Air Force is undergoing a truly remarkable change—including the removal of people from cockpits; training Airmen to deal on a person-to-person basis in different cultures; attacking tactical targets overseas with conventional ordnance using controllers located in the US. It would seem appropriate to address the question—given a force of the drone type—how do we prevent and respond to situations where data links, software, sensors, etc., are attacked via countermeasures?

(c) Microbiology: The mid-20th century was dominated to a considerable extent by advances in aircraft and space; the late 20th century and early 21st century by developments in the information sciences. The coming decade will be dominated by the biological sciences. This is certainly the case in the civilian world where engineered micro-organisms are performing tasks from making plastics to signaling the presence of disease. Most of the Board of Visitors briefings are still focused on information technologies, even those addressing the longer term. More focus on biology for detection, identification, “computation,” even limited attack would seem to be in order.

(d) The CSAT’s initiatives to use strategic frameworks, in partnership with the Air Force Research Laboratory (AFRL) and other technology development sponsors for identifying critical enabling technologies is very commendable, and appears to represent a good return on investment on the part of these sponsoring organizations. Recommend CSAT measure and look for more opportunities to explicitly share the impact it is having on AF technology investment strategy with AF leadership, thus strengthening the reputation of AU for providing solutions to AF challenges. The Board also recommends CSAT look for more opportunities to partner with AFIT technology centers in furthering the strategy and technology linkage given the co-location of AFIT and AFRL at Wright-Patterson AFB, a CSAT-AFIT partnership could enhance a continuing and more frequent interface between AU and AFRL.

2. National Security Forum: Air University conducts the National Security Forum (NSF) each year to provide an extended opportunity for candid engagement of ideas on future and current AF, joint, national, and international security issues among the Air War College students, faculty, and invited guests. Invitees are nominated by various AF organizations and approved by the Secretary of the Air Force. Several of the current BOV members have attended the NSF in the past and highly recommend other Board members to attend, if possible.

3. Regional Cultural Studies: The Board was briefed on the Regional Cultural Studies program as a follow-up to a previous Board recommendation (Ref: AU BOV Meeting Minutes, April 2008, #04-2008-06). Air War College employs multiple methods to measure the effectiveness of the program in general and the field studies in particular—demonstrating that the investment significantly enriches the students’ education and their developments as senior leaders.

F. Subcommittee Outbriefs: The Chair of the Undergraduate Education and Honorary Degree Subcommittees each provided their meeting outbrief to the full Board for review and discussion. The subcommittee meeting minutes are attached and the Board’s approved actions and recommendations (if any) are reflected in Sections III and IV of these minutes.

G. Board Structure Ad Hoc Committee Report: The Chair of the Board Structure Ad Hoc Committee facilitated a discussion on Tuesday afternoon concerning the current subcommittees and the feasibility of additional subcommittees. The Ad Hoc Committee's previous meeting minutes are attached and the Board's approved actions are reflected in Section III of these minutes.

H. The Board's requests, observations, and recommendations were presented to General Peck on Tuesday, 17 Nov 09, and are included in Section IV of these minutes.

I. Dr. Guererro asked for concluding remarks. There being none, the meeting was adjourned after dinner at 2030 on 17 Nov 09.

Section III: Board Actions

A. **April 2009 BOV Meeting Minutes.** The Board approved the April 2009 BOV Meeting Minutes.

B. **Future Meeting Dates.** The Board approved the next meeting date of 18-21 April 2010 at Maxwell AFB AL.

C. **Undergraduate Education Subcommittee.** The Board approved the Undergraduate Education Subcommittee meeting minutes as written.

D. **Honorary Degree Subcommittee.** The Board approved the subcommittee meeting minutes as written. The Chair also requested the Board members submit nominations for the next honorary degree recipient by 15 February 2010.

E. **Board Structure Ad Hoc Committee.** The Board approved the motion to create Ad Hoc Committees on a “trial” basis to support the functional and organizational areas of the university. The Board will review the new Ad Hoc Committees and evaluate which committees will be submitted for establishment as “Subcommittees.”

F. **SAASS Ph.D. Ad Hoc Committee.** The BOV Chair approved the continuance of the Ad Hoc Committee, with the addition of Dr. Ben Lambeth as a member and General (Ret) Pat Gamble as the Ad Hoc Committee Chair. The Chair charged the Ad Hoc Committee with the following:

1. Represent the Board in reviewing the progress of AU in developing the post-core curriculum components (experiential/assignments/advanced coursework) leading to the development of advanced strategists.

2. Monitor/review the SACS and Department of Education applications and when standards are satisfied, provide a recommendation to approve or disapprove to the AU BOV Chair for a final vote of the Board.

G. **Subcommittee Chair Appointments:** The BOV Chair reappointed Maj Gen (Ret) Stephen Condon as the Air Force Institute of Technology Subcommittee Chair and appointed Brig Gen (Ret) Clifton Poole as the Undergraduate Education Subcommittee Chair

H. **Status on Previous Board Requests, Observations, and Recommendations.** The Board approved Section V, of these minutes, as written.

I. **Commander Evaluation.** The Board officers met with the Air University Commander to conduct their formal, periodic evaluation of the Chief Executive Officer (Commander).

Section IV: Board Requests, Observations, and Recommendations

(Grouped by Center)

(Numbering Key: MM/YYYY/##)

A. AU Commander:

Request 11-2009-01: Given the changing nature of higher education and evolving nature of the Air Force, the Board would like a presentation on the long-range (10 years) vision and strategic plan for the educational programs of Air University. [OPR: AU A5/8]

Recommendation 11-2009-01: After lengthy discussions, the Board recommended AU continue to move forward in developing application for Level V status with the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS) and continue development of the curriculum for a SAASS PhD/doctoral degree with the purpose of meeting an Air Force need for advanced strategists. The Board also approved the continuance of the Ad Hoc Committee to assist AU with this process.

Request 11-2009-02: Air University has begun to move from a “.mil” to an “.edu” environment for most of its information technology activities. The Board supports this migration as appropriate to the mission of AU and requests that status be again updated at the next Board meeting. [OPR: AU A4/6]

B. AU Chief Academic Officer:

Recommendation 11-2009-02: The Board recommends AU provide an update on the review of effectiveness of instruction of online versus in-residence education and training. [OPR: CFAI]

C. AFRI:

Request 11-2009-03: The Board requests a more formal description of “research” entities and how they connect into AU organizations, differences in mission (if any), and where synergy and memorandums of understanding do or do not exist.

D. LeMay Center: No new items.

E. Spaatz Center:

Recommendation 11-2009-03: The Board recommends that thoughtful consideration be given to the selection process so that the value of attending the SAASS core program not be diminished for selectees who are not pursuing the PhD/doctoral track and that the proposal be vetted with experts in the field, internally (AU) and externally (other institutions and organizations) as appropriate.

Request 11-2009-04: In reference to the AU PhD/doctoral program, the BOV requests a report at the April meeting on progress made pursuant to the assignments curriculum issue.

Recommendation 11-2009-04: Recommend CSAT measure and look for more opportunities to explicitly share the impact it is having on AF technology investment strategy with AF leadership, thus strengthening the reputation of AU for providing solutions to AF challenges.

Recommendation 11-2009-05: Recommend CSAT look for more opportunities to partner with AFIT technology centers in furthering the strategy and technology linkage given the co-location of AFIT and AFRL at Wright-Patterson AFB, a CSAT-AFIT partnership could enhance a continuing and more frequent interface between AU and AFRL.

F. Barnes Center:

Recommendation 11-2009-06: The subcommittee recommended the AU leadership to continue to strongly support efforts to secure funding for a new physical fitness facility at Gunter for support of the enlisted professional military education programs.

Request 11-2009-05: The shortfall of available resources in support of EPME distance learning and the nuclear initiative was another item of concern to the subcommittee. In addition to urging Air University support for funding, the subcommittee requests continual updates on this issue.

Recommendation 11-2009-07: The subcommittee recommends the “Candidacy” status for the 85th Engineering Installation Squadron, Keesler AFB MS.

Recommendation 11-2009-08: The subcommittee recommends the “Candidacy” status for the 12th Operations Group-Det 1, Randolph AFB TX.

Recommendation 11-2009-09: The subcommittee recommends the “Candidacy” status for the Air Force Special Operations Training Center, Hurlburt Field FL.

G. Holm Center:

Request 11-2009-06: The Gold Bar Program and new opportunity created to take the AFOQT at the 3-year point were exciting programs which the subcommittee requested to have rebriefed in the Spring 2010 meeting when additional data will be available.

Recommendation 11-2009-10: The subcommittee recommended the AU leadership to continue to strongly support efforts to secure funding for a new dormitory in the Officer Training School complex.

H. AFIT: No new items.

I. Other Schools/Organizations: No new items.

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

(Grouped by Center)
(Numbering Key: MM/YYYY/##)

A. AU Commander:

Recommendation 04-2009-01: The Board recommends Air University Commander's position be titled "Commander and President" of Air University.

AU Response: Concur. Gen Norton Schwartz, Air Force (AF) Chief of Staff, as well as Air Education and Training Command (AETC), and the AF Legal Office have indicated approval to change the title of the AU Commander from "Commander" to "Commander and President." The AF Personnel Office has agreed to forward this information to AF General Officers Group to let them know this should be done upon Lt Gen Peck's departure, i.e., the next AU Change of Command, but not before. Locally, the personnel office will change the title on the position description after the confirmation to "Commander and President." [Recommended Action: OPEN (OPR: AU/A1. Provide status updates and confirmation of title change)]

Observation 04-2009-01: The Board was briefed on AU's network security program, and observed good progress in terms of leadership priority and completion of certifications and accreditations. However, the Board noted that the "dot mil" system is highly oriented towards the Microsoft Windows environment. Moving to "dot edu" might involve other kinds of systems (Unix, Mac, etc.) that require other expertise that may not be here.

AU Response: Concur. AU appreciates the Board's observation and AU will continue to research the requirements and options related to the "dot mil" and "dot edu" systems. [Recommended Action: CLOSED]

Request 04-2009-01: The Board was briefed on the AFSO21 process and requests information on how continuous improvement is being applied to AU. The Board also requests information on how "best practices" are accumulated, shared, and applied. Also, this information should include what professional education associations and training the trainers participate in to have their craft? Finally, the Board would like to know what kinds of evaluations are done after classes are completed.

AU Response: Concur. A Bullet Background Paper describing the management and key components of the AU AFSO21 was provided to the Board members during the November 2009 meeting. [Recommended Action: CLOSED]

Observation 04-2009-02: The Board was briefed on the status of resources to operate AU, including the areas of personnel, funding, MILCON and SRM projects, and FY10 POM results. The Board observed that from a macro perspective, AU appears to be competing well for AF-wide constrained resources, and shortfalls for AU do not appear to be disproportional vis-à-vis the rest of the Air Force. The Board also noted AU's strong community involvement initiatives, and commends that involvement.

AU Response: Concur. AU appreciates the Board’s observation and AU will remain mindful of the university’s limited resources. [Recommended Action: CLOSED]

B. AU Chief Academic Officer:

Request 04-2009-02: The Board requested that they be kept informed about the QEP by presenting reports on outcomes assessment in accordance with the QEP assessment chart.

AU Response: Concur. A Bullet Background Paper describing the QEP status (to include curriculum development and educational support efforts) was provided to the Board members during the November 2009 meeting. [Recommended Action: CLOSED]

Request 04-2009-03: The Board requested that they be kept informed about Business Objects progress by providing university-wide information on various areas.

AU Response: Concur. Business Objects Business Intelligence is Air University’s enterprise solution for drawing student data from approximately eight databases into one data mart from which statistics and reports can be developed. It delivers flexible Ad Hoc reporting and analysis, dashboards and visualization, and powerful data integration across various data sources. AU will keep the Board informed of its progress and provide university-wide information when available. [Recommended Action: CLOSED]

Request 04-2009-04: The Board expressed continuing interest in learning more about the curriculum content and research initiatives associated with space and cyberspace. Accordingly, the Board requests that future BOV agendas provide additional information regarding AU’s space and cyberspace initiatives and that such information be provided in the context of an integrated perspective for both AU Maxwell and AFIT. The Board also supports continual AU pursuit of a Space and Cyberspace Studies Center, and that such a center be formulated to leverage fully the AFIT Cyber Center.

AU Response: Concur. AU provided the Board information concerning space and cyberspace initiatives during the November 2009 meeting. [Recommended Action: CLOSED]

Request 04-2009-05: It would be helpful if AU could provide a chart(s) that reflected the various degree tracks and what feeds into those degrees.

AU Response: Concur. AU provided the Board an overview of the degree tracks during the November 2009 meeting. [Recommended Action: CLOSED]

Recommendation 04-2008-06: The Board recommends that AU develop measures of merit for Regional Cultural Studies (RCS) that complement current anecdotal justification and that more explicitly illustrate RCS’s “return on investment” as a means of justifying/advocating future RCS budgets.

AU Response: Concur. Air War College employs multiple methods to measure the effectiveness of the program in general and the field studies in particular—demonstrating that the investment significantly enriches the students’ education and their developments as senior leaders. [Recommended Action: CLOSED]

Recommendation 04-2008-08: The Board believes the current Bachelor's degree opportunities may be sufficient and recommends AU review the requirement and benefit to adding other avenues towards Bachelor's degrees

AU Response: Concur. The requirement and benefit of AU offering a Baccalaureate degree are still under consideration. [Recommended Action: OPEN. Update, as needed]

C. **AFRI Center:** No remaining "OPEN" items.

D. **LeMay Center:** No remaining "OPEN" items.

E. **Spatz Center:**

Recommendation 04-2009-02: The Board recognizes the Air Force's need to develop future leaders that think strategically regarding missions in the international and political arena. The nature of the AF will function at a more advanced technical level than ever before. In order for the Board to provide AU with advice and guidance on proceeding with the SAASS PhD degree program, the Board recommends AU provide the Board a prospectus including needs analysis, appropriateness of the degree type (e.g., Ph.D. versus terminal applied degree) and appropriateness of the academic content in terms of future AF leadership needs.

AU Response: Concur. AU provided the Board members the proposed prospectus for review prior to the November 2009 meeting and included discussion time on the November meeting agenda. [Recommended Action: CLOSED]

F. **Barnes Center:**

Recommendation 04-2009-03: The subcommittee recommends the "Affiliation" status for the USAF Special Operations School at Hurlburt Field FL.

AU Response: Concur. The USAF Special Operations School was "Affiliated" in April 2009 and is progressing satisfactorily. [Recommended Action: CLOSED]

Recommendation 04-2009-04: The subcommittee recommends the "Candidacy" status for the 39th Information Operations Squadron at Hurlburt Field FL.

AU Response: Concur. The 39th Information Operations Squadron was placed in "Candidacy" status in April 2009 and is progressing satisfactorily. [Recommended Action: CLOSED]

Recommendation 04-2009-05: The subcommittee recommends the "Disaffiliation" status for the 56th Operational Support Squadron at Luke AFB AZ.

AU Response: Concur. The 56th Operational Support Squadron was "Disaffiliated" in April 2009. [Recommended Action: CLOSED]

G. Holm Center:

Request 04-2009-06: The subcommittee requests an opportunity to review data concerning the AFOQT testing results.

AU Response: Concur. AU provided the Board information concerning AFOQT testing results during the November 2009 meeting. [Recommended Action: CLOSED]

H. AFIT:

Recommendation 04-2009-06: The Air Force Research Institute (AFRI) was started in 2008. It was an initiative of the Chief of Staff and its charter is to *focus on deeper research and provide independent analysis of key national issue*. Its mission is “*To conduct independent research, outreach, and engagement to enhance national security and assure the effectiveness of the United States Air Force.*” AFIT has many talented faculty members conducting research programs of vital interest to the USAF and USA. AFRI and AFIT may have mutual interests that would be of benefit to both institutions. AFIT should explore with AFRI to identify areas of mutual interest and potential ways that AFIT could collaborate on research efforts with AFRI.

AU Response: Concur. The AFRI Dean and the AFIT Dean for Research held discussions in July 2009 to identify additional opportunities in light of AFRI’s presentation during the April 2009 BOV meeting. They are considering information visits in fall 2009, possibilities for faculty sabbatical exchanges, and options for assignment of AFIT graduates to AFRI. [Recommended Action: CLOSED]

Recommendation 04-2009-07: The April 2007 AFIT Subcommittee report recommended that the AFIT Commandant establish an overarching outreach/communications plan with senior leaders at HQ USAF and the MAJCOMs, and the March 2008 Subcommittee report observed that the plan had indeed been established and partially implemented with good results. This year, the Subcommittee was briefed on the AFIT Commandant’s expectation that she and her senior leadership team members each visit a general officer/flag officer on the Air Staff, at a MAJCOM, and at a COCOM during the academic year. The Subcommittee was delighted to see that this plan has been fully implemented, with over 40 general officers/flag officers/SESs visited between October 08 and the present, and applauded the AFIT leadership team for this stellar accomplishment. As AFIT institutionalizes this initiative, the Subcommittee recommends that AFIT develop a list of “key stakeholders” among the GO/FO/SES population who are key customers, policy makers, or budget providers as candidates for the next iteration of outreach visits. Such a list would help focus future visits on those senior leaders who have the greatest influence on AFIT’s viability and future posture, and would serve to improve an already strong outreach initiative.

AU Response: Concur. AFIT has a list of key stakeholders in the population recommended by the BOV subcommittee. AFIT maintains contact with these people through its outreach program, in addition to regular office calls with certain stakeholders to provide updates on the issues that affect AFIT. A more comprehensive outreach approach is being worked and will be briefed at the next Subcommittee meeting. [Recommended Action: OPEN]

Recommendation 04-2009-08: The Subcommittee was briefed on the Air Force Center for Systems Engineering (CSE), and noted in particular the development of systems engineering

case studies on a number of AF aeronautical, space, and C2 programs. The Subcommittee applauds the progress to date on generating these case studies, and specifically the efforts to identify sound SE learning principles from the study results. While the case studies have been loaded on a web site for widespread access, the Subcommittee recommends that CSE examine methods for more proactive disposition of the case study results to complement the website availability. Such methods could include briefings to relevant Program Executive Officers or program managers, round-table discussions in relevant acquisition forums, classroom discussions, or other venues as appropriate. Furthermore, given that case studies have been generated on nine separate programs to date with additional studies planned, the Subcommittee recommends that CSE pursue an initiative to synthesize the results across the full set of case studies in an effort to identify common best practices and lessons learned.

AU Response: Concur. By the end of August 2009, case studies on Global Hawk and the KC-135 Simulator will be complete. AFIT/SY will schedule meetings by fall 2009 with the PEOs, chief engineers and program managers of each of these programs to summarize case study results. Each of these case studies will also be presented at national forums. For example, they are planned to be presented at the annual TechAmerica conference in September 2009 before an international audience. Other conferences will also be considered such as the NDIA Systems Engineering Conference in fall 2009. The AF CSE has completed an effort to synthesize the results/learning principles across all of AFIT's completed case studies and by September 2009 it will complete the action to identify common best practices and lessons learned. The AF CSE will also work with AFIT/EN and AFIT/LS to adopt the learning principles from these two new case studies into curriculum where appropriate. [Recommended Action: CLOSED]

Recommendation 04-2009-09: During the Center for Systems Engineering (CSE) briefing, the Subcommittee noted that while the AF CSE had been originated by former senior AF leaders and appears to be doing value-added work, there does not exist an Air Force-level document which codifies the expectations for or responsibilities of the CSE. Such a codification seems important in terms of assuring the CSE is addressing current AF needs and is using its resources in the most effective manner. The Subcommittee recommends that a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) be initiated between AFIT and SAF/AQ which includes codification of the mission and responsibilities of CSE. Such a document would not only provide a framework to guide CSE in its activities and priorities, but could also serve as a reference point for evaluating how well CSE is doing in accomplishing its mission.

AU Response: Concur. AFIT and the AF CSE are currently working with SAF/AQ to revise: (1) AF CSE's Directorate Charter and (2) AF CSE's Senior Council Charter to codify the missions and responsibilities between AFIT/SY and SAF/AQ. This effort is planned to be completed and coordinated with AFIT/SY, AFIT/CC, SAF/AQ, AFMC/EN, and AFSPC/A5 by August 2009. If it is still necessary to create an overarching MOU with SAF/AQ, the information contained in these two charters will become a part of that MOU. [Recommended Action: CLOSED]

Recommendation 04-2009-10: During separate meetings with a large group of students and then faculty members in the AFIT auditorium, the Subcommittee received persistent comments from both groups regarding the adverse impacts of faculty deployments to the Iraq/Afghanistan region. Collectively, the concerns expressed were three-fold: (1) some students had been adversely impacted by limited availability of faculty thesis/dissertation advisors, and by cancellation of some relatively new courses that could not yet sustain themselves in the absence

of the deployed faculty advocate; (2) faculty effectiveness was being degraded by mid-semester disruptions in teaching and by the need for some spool-up time back into the academic mode upon returning from deployments; and (3) both faculty and student research projects were being interrupted, resulting in (among other things) failure to deliver on-time research results to external research sponsors, with a resulting degradation in AFIT's relationship with those sponsors and the potential vectoring of future research projects by those sponsors to non-AFIT organizations. Given the multi-year Air Force investment and lead time to identify and educate AFIT military faculty members, the consensus of both students and faculty appeared to be that deployment of such members had not only near-term impacts on those directly affected, but could also have an adverse strategic impact on AFIT's long-range viability and effectiveness. The Subcommittee and AFIT both understand that we are on a wartime footing and that AFIT is a full player in meeting Air Force wartime commitments. In that context, the Subcommittee recommends that AFIT examine alternatives or solution sets that could reduce or minimize the adverse impacts of faculty deployments, and especially those particular deployments with readily identifiable adverse effects as discussed above. While the initial focus should be on those actions that are within AFIT's purview, such an analysis should also identify potential steps that agencies external to AFIT might implement to improve the overall situation.

AU Response: Concur. When a deployment will cause adverse circumstances within a program, AFIT will request a reclama according to the provisions outlined in Air Force Instruction 10-401, *Air Force Operations Planning and Execution*, to reclama a tasking. The last reclama using this provision was in March 2009. Given the operations tempo in certain stressed career fields, AFIT must be very careful to balance the needs of its students and deployment requirements. AFIT will continue to investigate ways to more effectively deploy its faculty to minimize impact on our students and external research sponsors. However, this is quite challenging given the changing nature and length of the deployment taskings. [Recommended Action: CLOSED]

Recommendation 04-2009-11: The requirements process for identifying advanced technical degree requirements in the Air Force appears to be fairly near-term focused. The process works well for identifying and filling near-term needs, but it may not meet the needs of the Air Force in the long term. As an example of a strategic approach, the Chief of Naval Operations has recently directed that 65% of the graduates of the Naval Academy and Naval ROTC be Science Technology and Engineering Mathematics (STEM). This offers the opportunity for a more strategic approach to identifying advanced technical degree requirements in the Navy. In the context of ongoing NRC STEM review, it is recommended that the AU BOV AFIT Subcommittee explore the possibility of a more strategic approach to determining future Air Force technical advanced degree requirements and assignments. The Subcommittee will begin with discussions with SAF/AQR and possibly involve the Air Force Chief Scientist and the Air Force Scientific Advisory Board, among others. Issues to be considered will include, among other things, long-term technical needs of the Air Force; selection processes; utilization of technical personnel and specific items such as Enlisted-to-AFIT and IDE programs. Any recommendations or suggestions coming from this exploration will be presented to the AU BOV at its fall 2009 meeting.

AU Response: Concur. AFIT shares the BOV subcommittee's concern with the process for identifying the long-term technical degree needs of the Air Force and appreciates the subcommittee's support. A discussion update will be provided during the next subcommittee meeting in March 2010. [Recommended Action: OPEN]

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

AU Response: Concur. AFIT will report the requested information during the March 2010 subcommittee meeting. [Recommended Action: OPEN]

Request 04-2009-08: The AFIT Center for Cyberspace Research has been designated by the USAF as a Center of Excellence. The Subcommittee applauds the Center for this recognition. However, Centers do not obtain or maintain excellence merely by being so named--effort must be expended to remain at that level in quality of research and recognition of that status by those outside of the organization. The Subcommittee requests that AFIT provide it an update at the next meeting on the efforts being taken to maintain the status of the Center as one of excellence.

AU Response: Concur. The term "excellence," as it relates to the Center for Cyberspace Research (CCR), has been bestowed by external organizations (the National Security Agency and Department of Homeland Security) based on criteria these organizations have established for their designation. The Air Force Cyberspace Technical Center of Excellence is a moniker bestowed on CCR by Headquarters Air Force. Performance metrics for evaluating Center "excellence" are consistent with those of the Graduate School of Engineering and Management (publications, research grants, outreach, technology transfer to the operational communities) and are tracked and presented to two guidance boards (the CCR Distinguished Review Board and the AF Cyberspace Education Board of Advisors) on a semi-annual basis. The CCR works closely with the AF, DoD, and national cyber communities to ensure the relevance of its research and education to the communities. In June 2009, the CCR was designated as a Center of Academic Excellence in Information Assurance Research by the NSA and DHS based on its research productivity (publications, faculty achievements, graduate numbers, and research grants awarded). This designation is for 5 years. The continued efforts of the CCR faculty and staff, as well as the cumulative efforts described above, should ensure the status of the Center as one of excellence. [Recommended Action: OPEN]

Observation 04-2009-03: In some of the briefings presented to the Subcommittee, other Centers were referred to as "Centers of Excellence." This is a term that is rather loosely used across the Air Force and in other areas as well. AFIT should be careful in the use of the term to ensure that its credibility is not diminished.

AU Response: Concur. AU understands the Board's concern with the "Centers of Excellence" term and will monitor the usage of this term. [Recommended Action: CLOSED]

Observation 04-2009-04: The Director of Staff briefed the Subcommittee on the major construction projects that supports AFIT's goal to build a world-class campus. Building 646 was recently completed as part of the FY06 MILCON project and Building 641 is currently being renovated with a projected completion date of June 2010. Other future MILCON projects include new research labs in FY12 and a library expansion in FY14. The Subcommittee was able to tour much of the AFIT physical facilities. It is reassuring to see the cleanliness and excellent conditions throughout. It is apparent, from these observations and from the recent and

planned new construction and renovations, that AFIT is being suitably supported by the USAF from a physical infrastructure perspective.

AU Response: Concur. AU appreciates the Board's comments. [Recommended Action: CLOSED]

Recommendation 04-2008-04: The AFIT Subcommittee recommends that the AFIT Commandant place increased emphasis on reaching the senior leadership of the MAJCOMs and COCOMs to communicate AFIT's value and direction and to institute regular communication with these commands.

AU Response: Concur. AFIT representatives have visited or hosted many visits with senior Air Force, sister-service, and DoD leaders. AFIT/CC made outreach a commander's expectation for the AY08-09. [Recommended Action: OPEN]

Request 04-2008-10: The AFIT School of Systems and Logistics conducted a program analysis on the education needs of USAF scientists, engineers, acquisition managers, contracting personnel, logistics readiness personnel, and maintenance personnel. The analysis identified a need to link certain intermediate courses to initial skills courses and to create or redesign courses in each career field to meet requirements. To maintain effectiveness, the continuous review and determination of course requirements would be overseen by a Distinguished Review Board consisting, as a minimum, of senior leaders from SAF/AQR, SAF/AQC, SAF/AQX, USAF/A4, and HQ AFMC. The AFIT Subcommittee fully supports this initiative of the AFIT School of Systems and Logistics and requests an update on the status at the next meeting of the subcommittee.

AU Response: Concur. Substantial research has gone into the requirements for courses in the School of Systems and Logistics. A presentation to the Science and Engineering Advisory Council (SEAC) was made by the AFIT Commandant requesting career field support for the scientist and engineering career fields. [Recommended Action: OPEN]

I. **Other Schools/Organizations:** No remaining "OPEN" items.



DOROTHY D. REED, Ph.D.
Designated Federal Officer
7 February 2010



TITO GUERRERO, EdD
Board Chairperson
7 February 2010