June 18, 2007

From: Chair, Board of Advisors to the President, Naval Postgraduate School
To: Secretary of the Navy
Via: (1) President, Naval Postgraduate School
(2) Chief of Naval Operations

Subj: FORTY-SEVENTH MEETING OF THE BOARD OF ADVISORS TO THE PRESIDENT, NAVAL POSTGRADUATE SCHOOL

Ref: (a) Public Law 92-463, Federal Advisory Committee Act
(b) SECNAVINST 1524.2B

Encl: (1) List of Board Members and Visitors in Attendance
(2) Tentative WASC Time Line

1. In accordance with references (a) and (b), the Naval Postgraduate School (NPS) Board of Advisors met on April 17-18, 2007 in Monterey, CA. Members in attendance are listed in Enclosure (1).

2. The Board is pleased to report that the NPS continues to provide an excellent graduate level education to the future strategic leaders of the armed forces of the U.S. and its coalition partners.

3. The Board was extremely pleased to join with new President, VADM (ret) Dan Oliver at its meeting within a few days of his assuming this important role. The Board members are convinced that this will be a great marriage, his breadth of experience and talent with opportunities provided by the broad capabilities resident at NPS. The Board members wanted to specifically acknowledge and thank the Provost, Dr. Leonard Ferrari, and the Chief of Staff, Col. David Smarsk, for their leadership in maintaining an effective environment at the NPS for the extended interim period before the new President could assume his duties. The Board is optimistic that the future looks very bright for NPS in terms of this leadership team.

4. The Board is very pleased to welcome aboard Brig Gen Melvin Spiese, USMC, as one of the USMC representatives to the Board. Having the contribution and insights of a current general officer of the US Marine Corps is extremely important to the Board’s considerations.
5. The Board noted that NPS was asked to respond to a proposal that the Boards of the Naval Postgraduate School and the Naval War College merge. This is but one of a number of consolidations proposed in a SECDEF memo entitled "Top-to-Bottom Review of the Department of Defense Federal Advisory Committee Management Program - Phase II." The rationale for these actions, which the writer suggests will "transform the Department of Defense's Federal Advisory Management Program," is that taking this step will streamline and consolidate the current committees and ensure that "...the decision makers are receiving a strategic assessment of the issues through integrated thinking and cross communications." The argument is, in part, that the Army and Air Force Secretaries sponsor a single discretionary board for education for each of their departments, while the Secretary of the Navy Sponsors two. The change for the Navy Department would merely put it on a par with the other Departments.

Your Board of Advisors has endeavored to see the advantage, either to this institution or to the Department of the Navy, deriving from such a merger. We cannot. In its response to DCNO Manpower and Personnel (N1) the NPS leadership argued four points with which we agree entirely and that we summarize below:

   a. Consolidating the NPS and NWC Boards would not result in a "Naval" Education Board. More mergers would be needed to reach this result and the diversity of the institutions represented would increase greatly. A truly Naval Board must embrace Marine Corps University, perhaps the Naval ROTC programs, the Naval Academy; these are fundamentally different educational enterprises, with boards constituted (in law) very differently to serve their needs. The NPS Board of Advisors is small, focused on graduate education and research, and committed to this specific institution.

   b. The Air University Board oversees all the educational institutions in a unified chain of command. A Naval university board would not.

   c. Always with a wise eye on the university accreditation process, NPS is concerned to some degree with the need (should this merger proceed) to explain the diffusion of oversight that would at least appear to result from combining the boards.

   d. Little cost savings would result. The NPS Board is inexpensive, the NWC Board costs even less. In comparison with
the education oversight boards of the other two Departments, our boards are small; they communicate well. We share at least one member with the NWC Board and are open to additional ideas that would foster conversations between our two memberships. We are unaware, though, of the Navy Departments' experiencing any difficulty as a consequence of there being two boards.

We recommend that the NPS Board of Advisors remain a separate entity supporting the President of NPS and the Secretary of the Navy.

6. The Board continues to review the progress and development process resulting from the NPT/AFIT Alliance. Much has been done. There is more to be considered as this Alliance evolves. With an environment necessitating declining enrollment particularly for AP officers, there are potentially valuable opportunities in the use of dual appointments for the faculty and joint research programs as examples of steps that could be of benefit to both institutions and further integrate the programs of the two institutions. The MOU underlying the Alliance is being updated and this could provide further opportunities for such activity. The Board plans to continue to urge further integration and efficiencies where appropriate.

7. At the last meeting, you charged the Board to work with NPS in the development of a strategic direction for the institution. The Board appointed a subcommittee chaired by Jack Borsting to work with the school on a strategic plan. A draft strategic plan was presented to the Board at this meeting and discussed at length. The Board approved the general direction and goals of the plan. A revised draft will be presented to the Board soon, with a goal to present the plan to the Secretary by June 15, 2007.

8. As usual, the Board is pleased with the continuing attention paid by NPS leaders to preparations for the next WASC accreditation of the University. Enclosure (2) is the tentative time line for those preparations and note that the process is well underway and appears set to proceed to an orderly and successful conclusion in early FY11. The Board will receive from the President and Provost brief reports on progress from time to time in coming meetings.

9. As part of this meeting, we spent our first morning dispersed among the Graduate School of Business and Public Policy, Graduate School of Operations and Information Sciences, School of International Graduate Studies, and Graduate School of
Engineering and Applied Sciences. In each instance, we were impressed with the breadth and scope of these schools. Everything about them is first rate. It was particularly gratifying to observe that many projects in the School of Engineering and Applied Science involved extensive hardware experimentation as well as theoretical work. Those members of the board who were students at NPS in earlier years very favorably contrasted the current era in the intensity of the study, the relevance of the courses and the general enthusiasm that resides at all levels with their experience. For example, the Centers that reside in the School of International Graduate Studies continue to expand, particularly in relevance to Homeland Security and Civil-Military Relations. The Center for Stabilization and Reconstruction Studies is just emerging from its start-up phase and shows great promise to fill an urgent national/international need. We were particularly pleased with the enthusiasm exhibited by the faculty and students of all of the Schools, and their earnest belief that what they are studying is pertinent to their continuing military/government careers.

10. Two lines of interdisciplinary work highly relevant to NPS were described during the meeting as possible candidates for the development of teaching and research programs. The first one involves business, systems engineering, information science and software science and their contributions to the acquisition process. The second focuses on the collection and analysis of intelligence information, and includes several technical fields, from physics and optics to operations research.

The development of complex engineered systems involves both engineering and management. How to manage that process is in large part in the domain of the business schools. How to produce the technologies and put the system together is an engineering problem. Most systems involve hardware and software. An additional requirement is that human factors and the interaction between people and machines must be clearly understood from the outset of any study or developmental effort. NPS has the capabilities needed to improve the existing practices in systems development and the management of acquisitions. These capabilities, however, are dispersed. A research and teaching program in the area of systems engineering, design and acquisition could be of great benefit to the Navy and the Armed Services in general.

The collection and analysis of intelligence information requires the technical and human capabilities to gather relevant
information, and a process by which to decide where to focus observation and collection. Next, one needs the analytic power to process information that is generally incomplete and imperfect, and a way to communicate the remaining uncertainties to the decision makers. This whole process requires an understanding of the potential value of different types of information given the decisions that they are meant to support. Through its operations research department in conjunction with its information science group, the NPS is in a good position to provide the foundations of research and teaching in the intelligence area. Such a program would be most useful to the intelligence community in general and Naval intelligence in particular.

As with all interdisciplinary programs, the challenge is to ensure that the faculty and the students are solidly grounded in specific disciplines, then exposed to the different fields of knowledge that contribute to the resolution of a practical problem. NPS has key elements in these two domains and needs to bring them together to create programs that allow the School to address some problems that are critical to the defense of the United States.

We wish to make another point regarding the very important interdisciplinary work at NPS.

After listening to the reports of the meetings of the Committee members with selected faculty and students in the various Schools, the issue of the positive and negative aspects of NPS interdisciplinary research was discussed. It was pointed out that for the Naval Service, such projects and studies were very positive, since these projects worked on important practical problems which clearly contributed to effectiveness of defense forces. Further, they often involved students of varied backgrounds (including those of foreign military services in many cases) whose paths would not naturally intersect in the course of their careers. In addition, these interdisciplinary projects involve civilian faculty, substantially enhancing their interest and understanding of the problems of the Naval Services. On the other hand, positive as these professional activities are for tenured faculty, it was pointed out that extensive participation by untenured Assistant Professors was risky to those individuals and the institution since these studies did not always contribute to the required professional academic focus of these younger faculty as they work to successfully complete the tenure process.
It was then observed that this interdisciplinary work contributes to a unique strength of NPS: its concentration on the Master's level work. Other doctoral degree granting institutions do not generally encourage students to pursue the Masters as a terminal degree as does the Postgraduate School. Their concentration is mostly on producing dissertations related to a particular highly focused academic discipline. Consequently, the NPS Masters, with its required essay or thesis, is usually much stronger than the corresponding degree in many civilian institutions where completing course work is the only requirement.

11. The Board discussed a preliminary approach made to us by the Chairman of the Defense Business Board; he suggested we develop some form of a partnership between his Board and NPS to improve the content of their work. This partnership, if properly established, could have great potential for NPS. Unless you have an objection, we will take the next steps to explore the possibility of a partnership.

12. The Board is pleased to note the progress made since our last meeting on complying with the desire of the Chief of Naval Personnel that NPS improve the school's ability to provide fundamental research and development in the field of manpower. Communications between the Graduate School of Business and Public Policy and N1 have been improved through its Strategic Affairs Office; this has resulted in a more robust MPTE research program that in 2007 will be represented by faculty research efforts from three of the four schools. RADM Greene (Chair for Systems Acquisition) has temporarily taken on the informal role of MPTE Chair, an action which is expected to improve the breadth of MPTE research at NPS significantly.

On a related subject, the Board is encouraged by the Human Resources Community's initiative to identify follow-on PCS orders early in the student's tenure at NPS. We understand that N1 has identified a dedicated resource to coordinate relevant research topics with a student's next command. We look forward to a future update on this effort. If deemed successful, we will advocate this process be strongly considered for other Navy officer communities.

13. NPS will celebrate its centennial during 2009-2010. On June 9, 1909, Secretary of the Navy George von L. Meyer signed General Order No. 27, establishing a school of marine engineering at Annapolis which eventually became today's Naval Postgraduate School in Monterey, California. The planning for
the celebration is underway and communications will occur over the late 2007 to June 9, 2009 and beyond.

The objective of the Centennial celebration is to build and strengthen an appreciation for military education and to promote the role of education and its related research within the Navy, DoD, and our NATO allies. Each School and Institute will focus on the following objectives:

- Providing higher visibility for NPS and recognition of its contributions to Navy and DoD
- Increasing public awareness of NPS' contributions to improved military missions
- Providing an historical record of NPS' first century
- Improving linkages with the international sector
- Developing better connections with alumni
- Enhancing NPS academic and research programs
- Recognizing individual, department, and school achievements
- Enhancing student recruitment
- Boosting morale of faculty, staff and students
- Improving linkages to the local community
- Providing a concise statement of our desired future and the challenges we face in achieving that future.

Although the preparations have just commenced, it would be extremely helpful if the preparations for this centennial event could be coordinated through the Department of the Navy to ensure a comprehensive communications and events campaign.

Respectfully submitted,

Mr. G. Kim Wincup
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Enclosure (1)
The proposed timetable for the Capacity and Educational Effectiveness (EE) reviews is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time Period</th>
<th>Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>November 2006</td>
<td>Appointment of task forces for the themes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 2006 – December 2007</td>
<td>Collection, review, and analysis of data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January - March 2008</td>
<td>Data analysis continues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Steering Committee reviews task force reports &amp; recommendations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April - June 2008</td>
<td>Data analysis continues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>First Draft of CPR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July - September 2008</td>
<td>Data analysis continues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>First reading and comment by campus; first revisions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October - December 2008</td>
<td>Data analysis continues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CPR Report out to campus for review and comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January - March 2009</td>
<td>Data analysis continues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Final Revision of CPR Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April - June 2009</td>
<td>Submission of Final CPR Report to WASC and Visit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Completion of data analysis for EE Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July – December 2009</td>
<td>First Draft of EE Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January - March 2010</td>
<td>First reading and comment by campus; first revisions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April - June 2010</td>
<td>EE Report out to campus for review and comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July - September 2010</td>
<td>Final Revision of EE Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October - November 2010</td>
<td>Submission of Final EE Report to WASC and Visit</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Enclosure (2)