

1992

An analysis of the National War College

Thom H. Terwilliger

College of William & Mary - School of Education

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarworks.wm.edu/etd>



Part of the [Educational Administration and Supervision Commons](#), [Higher Education Commons](#), and the [Other Education Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Terwilliger, Thom H., "An analysis of the National War College" (1992). *Dissertations, Theses, and Masters Projects*. Paper 1539618414.

<https://dx.doi.org/doi:10.25774/w4-dsf1-zf69>

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Theses, Dissertations, & Master Projects at W&M ScholarWorks. It has been accepted for inclusion in Dissertations, Theses, and Masters Projects by an authorized administrator of W&M ScholarWorks. For more information, please contact scholarworks@wm.edu.

INFORMATION TO USERS

This manuscript has been reproduced from the microfilm master. UMI films the text directly from the original or copy submitted. Thus, some thesis and dissertation copies are in typewriter face, while others may be from any type of computer printer.

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted. Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleedthrough, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send UMI a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.

Oversize materials (e.g., maps, drawings, charts) are reproduced by sectioning the original, beginning at the upper left-hand corner and continuing from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps. Each original is also photographed in one exposure and is included in reduced form at the back of the book.

Photographs included in the original manuscript have been reproduced xerographically in this copy. Higher quality 6" x 9" black and white photographic prints are available for any photographs or illustrations appearing in this copy for an additional charge. Contact UMI directly to order.

U·M·I

University Microfilms International
A Bell & Howell Information Company
300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346 USA
313/761-4700 800/521-0600



Order Number 9317244

An analysis of the National War College

Terwilliger, Thom H., Ed.D.

The College of William and Mary, 1992

Copyright ©1993 by Terwilliger, Thom H. All rights reserved.

U·M·I
300 N. Zeeb Rd.
Ann Arbor, MI 48106

AN ANALYSIS OF THE NATIONAL WAR COLLEGE

A Dissertation

Presented to

**The Faculty of the School of Education
The College of William and Mary in Virginia**

In Partial Fulfillment

Of the Requirements for the Degree

Doctor of Education

by

Thom H. Terwilliger

December 1992

AN ANALYSIS OF THE NATIONAL WAR COLLEGE

by

Thom H. Terwilliger

Approved December 1992 by

John R. Thelin

John R. Thelin, Ph.D.
Chair of Doctoral Committee

James M. Yankovich

James M. Yankovich, Ed.D.

Armand J. Galfo

Armand J. Galfo, Ed.D.

DEDICATION

In memory of my mother and friend, Barbara
Holton Terwilliger, who was the inspiration for
my success; and to Bethany Toshiko Bryson, my
God-daughter who gives me happiness

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS iii

ABSTRACT v

Chapter

1. INTRODUCTION 2

 The Accreditation of Military War Colleges

 Hypothesis

 Research Questions

 Research Methodology

 Limitations of the Study

2. LITERATURE REVIEW 16

 Accreditation

 Military War Colleges

 Summary

3. ACCREDITATION 36

 Accreditation Defined

 History of Accreditation

 Accreditation Today

 Conclusions

4. THE NATIONAL WAR COLLEGE 78

 Location and History of the National War
 College

 Evolution of the National War College

 Mission

 Organization and Administration

The National War College Curriculum	
Students and Faculty	
Conclusions	
5. THE CASE STUDY	139
Introduction	
The Flexner Model	
The Selden and Porter Paradigm	
Dissenting Factors Associated with Accreditation	
6. CONCLUSIONS	196
Implications of the Study	
Areas for Further Study	
PRIMARY SOURCES	202
Published Works	
Journals and Publications	
Other Documents	
Interviews	
VITA	219

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

There are many who have directly and indirectly inspired and supported the fulfillment of this work. First, I thank Vice Admiral J. A. Baldwin, president of National Defense University and Major General Gerald P. Stadler, commandant of the National War College, who allowed me to use the National War College as a case study for this dissertation. I also thank Lieutenant Colonel Tommie Cayton, director of Academic Programs, for his expertise and assistance throughout the project. I am grateful for the assistance and cooperation of the National Defense University Library archivist, Ms. Susan Lemke and the assistant archivist, Ms. Tina Lasko who provided support with the material in Chapter 4.

I extend my appreciation to the many who provided research to me through interviews and other research avenues and extend a special note of gratitude to the Honorable Ike Skelton, Congressman from Missouri and Chair of the House Armed Services Committee Panel on Military Education.

Special recognition is made to my colleagues at Langley Air Force Base and the Air Staff without whose support this project would not have been possible.

The project would not have been possible without the generous assistance and patience of Mrs. Diana L. Davis, my good friend who dedicated her time and interest in the project by typing and editing hours of interview transcripts.

Finally, I take this opportunity to thank Professors James M. Yankovich and Armand Galfo, my dissertation committee members, for their assistance, time, and expertise in bringing the dissertation into fruition. Most importantly, I thank Chancellor Professor John R. Thelin for his guidance throughout my doctoral program as my faculty advisor, chair of my doctoral committee, and chair of this dissertation committee. His comments, suggestions, and guidance brought organization to my program and research project.

AN ANALYSIS OF THE NATIONAL WAR COLLEGE

ABSTRACT

The higher education's voluntary system of self-regulation is the accreditation process which recognizes institutions and their degrees with an established level of performance, integrity, and quality entitling them to the confidence of the educational community and the public they serve. The process forces institutions to answer questions about what constitutes a bona fide college in the United States. It is in the process of applying for accredited status that an institution must answer questions about its institutional mission and identity.

It was hypothesized that if the National War College fits the model of a professional school and volunteers to seek accreditation, then the benefits of the accreditation process will provide for an enhanced program and successful accreditation will enhance the professional status of the National War College in the higher education community.

In addition to the general hypothesis, the study considered how military professional military education fits into the community of higher education, whether

regional or specialized accreditation was more appropriate for the National War College, why accreditation was sought, and what external influences impacted accreditation.

The accreditation process was examined through a qualitative case study on the National War College at Fort Lesley J. McNair in Washington, DC. First, the research tested Alexander Flexner's model for a profession and then, the affect of accreditation and the accreditation process on free-standing institutions like the National War College was analyzed using the paradigm of William Selden and Harry Porter.

It was found that the profession of arms resembled the Flexner model for a profession which includes six criteria: intellectual, learned, practical, have a communicable technique, emulate self-organization, and altruism is a motivating force. Further, the research showed that although the accreditation process was not without criticism, the benefits of establishing minimum standards, stimulating improvement, and assisting in the protection against deleterious forces are benefits that the National War College and professional military educational institutions can expect from accreditation.

In addition, it was concluded that regional accreditation was the most appropriate method of

recognition over specialized accreditation.

In sum, it was found that professional military education had a legitimate niche in higher education. While this research provides a basis for understanding professional military education, more research will further assist academicians understand this widely misunderstood profession. Most importantly, it was shown that the accreditation process is applicable for federal-degree granting institutions which are atypical of most member institutions of accreditation bodies.

THOM H. TERWILLIGER
DEPARTMENT OF HIGHER EDUCATION
THE COLLEGE OF WILLIAM AND MARY IN VIRGINIA

AN ANALYSIS OF THE NATIONAL WAR COLLEGE

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Our contemporary society is characterized by a highly disaggregated and heterogeneous system of education.¹ Accreditation is a voluntary process which recognizes institutions and their degrees with an established level of performance, integrity, and quality entitling them to the confidence of the educational community and the public they serve.² The process forces institutions to answer questions about what constitutes a bona fide college in the United States. Embraced in the decision to seek accreditation is the basic question of whether regional or specialized accreditation is more appropriate. It is in the process of applying for accredited status that an institution must answer these questions. Therefore, a case study of an institution that is pursuing that status allows us to examine some significant questions about institutional mission and

¹Ernest A. Lynton and Sandra E. Elman, New Priorities for the University (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1987), 101.

²Council on Postsecondary Accreditation, Directory of Recognized Accrediting Bodies (Washington, DC: Council on Postsecondary Accreditation, 1991), 1.

identity.

Our system of colleges and universities ranges from research universities to federal institutions to proprietary colleges. Among these many types of institutions, the issue of diversity among professional schools has erupted over the past century. The controversy focused on what disciplines professional schools served and whether those professional schools should be free-standing institutions or subordinate colleges under a multiversity.³ Abraham Flexner shaped much of what we consider professional schools today. His landmark study of medical schools in 1910 forced many of the free-standing medical schools to close because they operated below the level of a minimum standard. Then, in 1915 he identified a basic model of professional status that remains valid today.⁴ His criteria requires that the activities of a profession be intellectual, learned, practical, have teachable techniques, have a strong internal organization, and that altruism be a motivating

³Earl F. Cheit, The Useful Arts and the Liberal Tradition (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1975), 1-30; Clark Kerr, The Uses of the University (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1963; reprint, 1982), 1-2 (references are to reprint edition).

⁴Cheit, The Useful Arts and the Liberal Tradition, 21-22.

force for professional work.⁵

Early professional instruction proceeded under insecure conditions. However, new professional schools gained status by following the paths of the traditional professions with the development of their own programs, admission standards, curricula, requirements for degrees, and autonomy within the institution.⁶ The increase in specialized accreditation helped to pave the way for professional schools to separate themselves from past problems. They are no longer isolated elements of higher education but regarded as centers of strength, innovation, and stability.⁷

Accreditation is an important issue in higher education because many constituencies are served by accreditation and the accreditation process: the public, students, institutions of higher education, federal and state governments, and the professions.⁸ Equally important, the process forces institutions to ask themselves: "What are we doing? Why? What should we be

⁵Ibid.

⁶Ibid., 23. The traditional professions were medicine, law, and theology.

⁷Ibid., 135.

⁸Council on Postsecondary Accreditation, The Role and Value of Accreditation (Washington, DC: Council on Postsecondary Accreditation, 1982).

doing? What is our purpose?"⁹ Although not usually a headline news story, accreditation is frequently blended into articles in professional newspapers, scholarly journals, and new books.

The Accreditation of Military War Colleges

A growing segment of professional schools are those in the armed forces. While some of the education is provided by cooperating colleges and universities, a substantial amount is generated within the armed forces and other government agencies and little reliable information exists about these activities.¹⁰

More specifically, military war colleges culminate a three-tiered system of professional military education beyond an officer's commissioning source. A select number of officers in the grade of Lieutenant Colonel and Colonel (or Commander and Captain in the U.S. Navy) attend these colleges. In addition to military officers, senior level federal employees and foreign officers also attend these programs. War colleges prepare these senior leaders for increased responsibility as general or Naval flag officers. Six military war colleges exist within

⁹Cheit, The Useful Arts and the Liberal Tradition, 30.

¹⁰Lynton and Elman, New Priorities for the University, 103.

the Department of Defense.

The oldest war college is the Naval War College in Newport, Rhode Island founded in 1884.¹¹ Twenty-seven years later, in 1901, the charter for the Army War College was approved and its doors were opened in 1903 at the Washington Barracks (later renamed Fort Lesley J. McNair) in Washington, DC and was later moved to Carlisle Barracks in Pennsylvania.¹²

By 1924, another war college was chartered by the Department of Defense. Although the college was called the Army Industrial College, it had the similar mission of training senior military officers in the intricacies of industry's mobilization for modern war. The Army Industrial College was renamed the Industrial College of the Armed Forces in 1946¹³ and is considered a senior college equivalent to the military war colleges.

¹¹John B. Hattendorf, B. Mitchell Simpson III, and John R. Wadleigh, Sailors and Scholars The Centennial History of the United States Naval War College (Newport, RI: Naval War College Press, 1984), 1.

¹²John W. Masland and Laurence I. Radway, Soldiers and Scholars Military Education and National Policy (Princeton: NJ: Princeton University Press, 1957), 320; George S. Pappas, Prudens Futuri: The US Army War College, 1901-1967 (Carlisle Barracks, PA: The Alumni Association of the U.S. Army War College, 1967), 228.

¹³National Defense University, National Defense University 1991-1992 Catalogue (Washington, DC: National Defense University Press, [1991]), 12.

The next two war colleges were founded in 1946. The Air Force formed the Air War College at Maxwell Air Force Base, Alabama¹⁴ and the National War College was founded in Washington, D.C. The National War College and the Industrial College of the Armed Forces became subordinate colleges of the National Defense University at Fort McNair in 1976.¹⁵

The last war college, the Marine Corps War College at Quantico, Virginia, was founded in 1990.¹⁶

Journalist Scott Jashik reported on an article entitled, "A college for the next generation of military leaders" in the March 13, 1991 issue of The Chronicle of Higher Education.¹⁷ His article discussed the initiative of the National War College to seek regional accreditation and the authority to award degrees.

Because the National War College is a federal institution, it must receive approval to seek

¹⁴Air University, Air War College Bulletin: 1990-1991 (Maxwell AFB, AL: Air University, 1991), 1.

¹⁵National Defense University, National Defense University Catalogue, 12.

¹⁶Margaret Roth, ed., Handbook for Military Families: 1992 Edition (Springfield, VA: Army Times Publishing Company, 1992), 86-87.

¹⁷Scott Jashik, "A College for the Next Generation of Military Leaders," The Chronicle of Higher Education, 13 March 1991, A3.

accreditation from the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and an endorsement from the U. S. Department of Education. The endorsement by the Department of Education is a two-phased process; a self study is followed by an open forum with the National Advanced Committee of the Department of Education for Accreditation where anyone who, pro or con, may testify. If approved by the Department of Education, the Secretary of Education recommends approval to Congress. Congress has the authority to approve the award of degrees. The final step is accreditation by the appropriate regional accreditation association or the Middle States Association of Colleges and Schools in the case of the National War College.

The examination of war colleges has two primary purposes. First, accreditation of war colleges tests the amount of diversity that higher education and accreditation can accommodate in a period when diversity is in the forefront of academicians. Second, the process of accreditation claims of specific benefits to member institutions which can be tested through the military war colleges. Accreditation of military institutions is not entirely new. The Service academies, graduate schools, Community College of the Air Force, and other subordinate professional military education are all regionally

accredited. Within the realm of military war colleges, the Naval War College in Newport, Rhode Island was accredited in 1991 of the Naval War College by the New England Association of Schools and Colleges.

Hypothesis

The proper recognition for the completion of the National War College curriculum has been the center of debate since 1954 when the commandant, General Craig sought accreditation by the Middle States Association of Colleges and Schools and the authority to award a Master's degree.¹⁸ While the college could award a degree without either regional or specialized accreditation, Craig eloquently wrote to the National War College Board of Consultants, "We clearly recognize that such a degree [a Master's degree] without suitable accreditation would be worse than useless."¹⁹

¹⁸H[oward] A. Craig, in a letter to the Joint Chiefs of Staff, 20 July 1954, Subject: Authorization for Granting a Master's Degree by the National War College, Carbon copy, Special Collections, National Defense University, Washington, DC.

¹⁹H[oward] A. Craig, Report by the Commandant, the National War College, to the Board of Consultants, 21 April 1955, Special Collections, National Defense University Library, Washington, DC; Alfred Z. Reed, "Professional Recognition, Accountability, and Licensure," in Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching Thirty-second Annual Report (Boston: The Merrymount Press, 1937), 41-63. Reed noted that when private agencies confer degrees, a more appropriate

Therefore, the hypothesis of this research project is:

If the National War College fits the model of a professional school and volunteers to seek accreditation, then the benefits of the accreditation process will provide for an enhanced program and successful accreditation will enhance the professional status of the National War College in the higher education community.

The initial position of this research is that the National War College will satisfy the model for a professional school and that regional accreditation is the best source of recognition of the National War College program. Specialized accreditation since its inception has been to foster excellence among professional undergraduate and graduate schools, it is often linked to licensure. Further, specialized accreditation bodies evaluate a specific program, or unit--not the entire institution.²⁰ The National War

description is "professional recognition" over conferring of an accredited degree.

²⁰Middle States Association of Colleges and Schools, What is Accreditation (Philadelphia: Middle States Association of Colleges and Schools, [1991], 10.

College seeks more than professional recognition²¹ and its planned degree is not linked to licensure.

An accredited degree provides legitimacy to the profession of national security and provides recognition of the National War College by peer institutions of higher education in the United States.

Research Questions

In addition to the aforementioned hypothesis, this study will examine and consider four additional research questions.

1. Despite the unique and non-traditional of war colleges, is there a niche in the higher education enterprise for these institutions?
2. Should military war colleges be accredited by regional or specialized accreditation?
3. Why do these institutions seek accreditation; is it to seek credibility by the academic community or for internal purposes?
4. What external influences impact accreditation

²¹The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching identified clarification between accredited and licensed institutions. The foundation concluded that specialized accreditation seeks to license individuals while regional accreditation accredits the institution as a whole. See Reed, "Professional Recognition, Accountability, and Licensure," 41-63.

of these unique federal institutions: Department of Education, Congress, or the accreditation agencies?

Research Methodology

The method of research will be a qualitative case study on accreditation that focuses on the National War College at Ft. Lesley J. McNair in Washington, DC. The first objective of the research is to test Alexander Flexner's model for a profession. Then, the effect of accreditation and the accreditation process on free-standing institutions like the National War College is analyzed.

A qualitative case study is selected because a key characteristic of qualitative research is the natural setting as the direct source of data.²² Further, the proposed study of the National War College meets the criteria of an evaluative case study because it involves description, explanation, and judgement.²³ Examination of the National War College is best learned by

²²Robert C. Bogdan and Sari K. Bilken, Qualitative Research for Education (Needham Heights, MA: Allyn and Bacon, 1992), 29.

²³Ibid., 30; Sharan B. Merriam, Case Study Research in Education: A Qualitative Approach (San Francisco, Jossey-Bass, 1988), 28. Bogdan and Bilken identify that one of the characteristics of qualitative research is descriptive.

understanding its history and by observing the institution as it operates.²⁴ Finally, qualitative research is concerned with the processes than simply outcomes or products²⁵ as the accrediting standards too, are concerned with stable processes that ensure an institution's future success and credibility.

The research will begin with a literature review on both accreditation and the military war colleges. Then, the history and evolution of accreditation as well as an analysis of the accreditation process and its standards will be presented.

In addition to the history and purposes of accreditation, the history, mission, and characteristics of war colleges, specifically the National War College, will be presented to enlighten the reader on this relatively unfamiliar type of institution.

To ensure validity, the process of triangulation included three data collection procedures. First, a catalog review of the National War College was made to identify areas that satisfy the Flexner model. Next, interviews of college officials were conducted and included the president of National Defense University,

²⁴Bogdan and Bilken, Qualitative Research for Education, 30.

²⁵Ibid., 31.

the commandant of the National War College, deputy director of the Joint Staff for military education, director of administration, director of academic affairs, university librarian, deans of students and faculty, department chairs, and faculty members. A total of 12 of 41 faculty members were interviewed for this research project and included both military and civilians (agency appointees, contracted, and civil service appointees). In addition, interviews of federal officials and leaders in higher education organizations that have an impact on the accreditation of the college were conducted. Included were the chair of the Panel on Military Education for the House Armed Services Committee, the vice president of the American Council on Education, recognized leaders of the Council on Postsecondary Accreditation, the executive director of accreditation and institutional eligibility for the U.S. Department of Education, and a member of the Joint Staff for military education.

In addition, the literature through published materials, catalogs, journal articles, and Congressional testimony was used to help substantiate the data. Finally, the university archives and other historical documents were examined.

Limitations of the Study

The primary limitation of the study is that the focus is on one of four tiers of professional military education, the war colleges. Subordinate professional military education programs will only be discussed in defining higher education within the Department of Defense.

A second limitation to the study is that the accreditation process at the National War College is ongoing and final accreditation decisions of the college will not be available until long after the study is completed.

CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

In the macro perspective, there is a limited amount of literature on accreditation and even less on military war colleges. Nevertheless, to accommodate a fair review of the primary pieces of work on both accreditation and the military war colleges, this review is divided into two sections.

The first section focuses on accreditation. Its history, mission and purpose, and the trends and directions of accreditation will constitute the subsections. The second section targets military war colleges. This section will discuss the broad literature on military education and then focus on the history and purpose of the various Services, war colleges. Because this study's focus is on the National War College, the third subsection is an in-depth review of the literature on the history and purpose of that institution.

Accreditation

History

The history of accreditation spans a period of nearly one hundred years. There are two primary works

that provide a comprehensive historical review of the evolution of accreditation. The first and most detailed is William Selden's Accreditation: A Struggle Over Standards in Higher Education.²⁶ This book, published over thirty years ago, provides a well documented history of the emergence of accreditation. In less than 100 pages, he adequately discusses the history of both regional and specialized accreditation agencies. Further, he provides a cursory assessment of accreditation over its first fifty years.

The second, and most widely used source by authors of journal articles and other materials that seek a background on the accreditation process is Understanding Accreditation edited by Kenneth Young, Charles Chambers, H. R. Kells, and associates.²⁷ This book is divided into several key areas of interest. Examples of the key areas are regional accreditation, specialized accreditation, and the influence of the federal government on accreditation. The book is a collection of pieces written by prevalent experts on accreditation.

The most significant limitations on the work of

²⁶William K. Selden, Accreditation: A Struggle Over Standards in Higher Education (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1960).

²⁷Kenneth Young and others, eds., Understanding Accreditation (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1983).

Selden and of Young and others is the relationship of the historical period from the late 1800s when accreditation was blossoming. Therefore, the history of accreditation must be augmented by other literature. Specifically, Laurence Veysey's The Emergence of the American University²⁸ and Frederick Rudolph's The American College and University: A History²⁹ provide in-depth details to key events in the early 1900s influencing and advancing the rise of accreditation. Rudolph adds detail to the early events identifying the needs for accreditation tracing it back to a meeting called by Harvard president Eliot at Williamstown, Massachusetts. Finally, the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching's annual reports,³⁰ specifically between 1935 and 1938, provide period essays on accreditation by Alfred Reed, a staff writer for the Carnegie Foundation. These essays

²⁸Laurence R. Veysey, The Emergence of the American University (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1965).

²⁹Frederick Rudolph, The American College & University: A History (New York: A. Knopf, 1962; reprint, Athens, GA: University of Georgia Press, 1990) (references are to reprint edition).

³⁰Reed, "Professional Recognition, Accountability, and Licensure," 41-63; idem, "Origins of Licensing in the Learned Profession," in Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching Thirty-third Annual Report (Boston: The Merrymount Press, 1938), 76; idem, "Accrediting Agencies," in Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching Thirty-fourth Annual Report (Boston: The Merrymount Press, 1939), 29-44.

provide both praise and criticism on the philosophy of accreditation and the purposes accreditation serves the general higher education community.

The history of accreditation can also be traced through various journal articles. William McVey wrote a thoughtful essay capturing the historical significance of the development of accreditation standards in 1946³¹ that provided triangulation with the information in William Selden's book. Two other articles provide period perspectives on the growth of the accreditation standards as they were emerging. One was Floyd Reeves' 1931 article in the American Association for University Professors Bulletin. The other was an article written by A. J. Brumbaugh in an article in a 1950 volume of The Educational Record.³²

Finally, a more recent book that includes a brief, yet lively historical look at accreditation is Lewis Mayhew, Patrick Ford, and Dean Hubbard's The Quest for Quality: The Challenge for Undergraduate Education in the

³¹William E. McVey, "Developing Accreditation Standards," Phi Delta Kappan 27 (May 1946): 253-256.

³²Floyd W. Reeves, "Educational Discussion: The Need for New Methods of Accrediting Institutions of Higher Learning," American Association of University Professors Bulletin 17 (November 1931): 522-530; A. J. Brumbaugh, "The Accrediting Agencies Face Their Common Problems," The Educational Record 31 (January 1950): 59-91.

1990s.³³

Mission and Purpose

The mission and purpose of accreditation is best defined by the Higher Education Bibliography Yearbook 1987³⁴ and the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching in Control of the Campus: A report on the Governance of Higher Education.³⁵ In addition, the mission and purpose of accreditation is weaved throughout Understanding Accreditation.³⁶

A plentiful source of information on the mission and purpose of accreditation is the quantity of material that is distributed by the Council on Postsecondary Accreditation, the national coordinating organization for accreditation, and the six regional and many specialized accreditation agencies. With the focus on the mission

³³Lewis B. Mayhew, Patrick J. Ford, and Dean L. Hubbard, The Quest for Quality: The Challenge for Undergraduate Education in the 1990s (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1990), 209-231.

³⁴R. M. Millard, J. K. Folger, and J. D. Millett, "Institutional Mission, Quality, and Accreditation," in Higher Education Bibliography Yearbook 1987 (Washington, DC: Research Associates of Washington, 1987), 101.

³⁵Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, Control of the Campus: A Report on the Governance of Higher Education (Lawrenceville, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1982), 15-36.

³⁶Young and others, Understanding Accreditation.

and purpose of accreditation, the Council on Postsecondary Accreditation's publications include the 1990 COPA Handbook³⁷ which provides an overview of the council, policy statements, and guidelines; The Role and Value of Accreditation³⁸ which highlights the importance of accreditation; and Accreditation and the Role of the Council on Postsecondary Accreditation³⁹ with the purpose of tying together the roles of this national organization with regional and specialized agencies.

In addition to pamphlets and handbooks, the accreditation agencies also publish a variety of papers presented at conferences and other documents that promote the interests of accreditation. An important and useful publication written by William Selden and Harry Porter⁴⁰ clarifies the purposes of accreditation and provides a thoughtful examination of the many public and private constituents of accreditation.

³⁷Council on Postsecondary Accreditation, The COPA Handbook (Washington, DC: Council on Postsecondary Accreditation, 1990).

³⁸Idem, The Role and Value of Accreditation.

³⁹Gloria Chernay, Accreditation and the Role of the Council on Postsecondary Accreditation (Washington, DC: Council on Postsecondary Accreditation, 1989).

⁴⁰William K. Selden and Harry V. Porter, Accreditation: Its Purposes and Uses (Washington, DC: Council on Postsecondary Accreditation, 1977).

Two key pamphlets from regional accreditation associations merit mentioning. The first is a reprint from the North Central Association Quarterly⁴¹ on the philosophy of accreditation. Frederick Crosson takes the approach that the self-study of an institution is to help guide the college or university toward continuous improvement and in that same spirit, the accreditation process itself is in need of self-evaluation to ensure the purposes of accreditation have not given way to hidden agendas or that they adequately have changed with the community it seeks to serve. The second is the standards that are used to determine eligibility for accreditation by the Middle States Association of Colleges and Schools.⁴² This booklet includes a listing of the areas that are reviewed in the self-study as well as the site visit by the evaluation team and include

⁴¹Frederick Crosson, "The Philosophy of Accreditation," North Central Association Quarterly 62 (Fall 1987) reprinted by the Council on Postsecondary Accreditation, 1988.

⁴²Middle States Association of Colleges and Schools, Commission on Higher Education, Characteristics of Excellence in Higher Education: Standards for Accreditation (Philadelphia: Middle States Association of Colleges and Schools, 1990). These standards are included over the standards of another regional association because the Middle States Association that has the authority for the accreditation of colleges and universities in Washington, DC, the location of the National War College.

fifteen different areas of interest ranging from the governing board to the physical plant and equipment.

Supplementing the literature on regional accreditation, specialized accreditation is also an important issue for review. The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching provides comments and criticisms in their recent publication, Control of the Campus,⁴³ as well as a brief evolution of specialized accreditation. In addition, two journal articles flesh out some of the issues that face specialized accreditation agencies. The first is Sarah Dinham and Linda Evans' article, "Assessment and Accreditation in Professional Schools."⁴⁴ This article discusses assessment and accreditation from undergraduate through graduate schools for nine specialized fields of study. In addition, B. M. Hagerty and Joan Stark⁴⁵ report on a comparative study of specialized accreditation standards of selected professional fields. Finally, H. R. Kells

⁴³Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, Control of the Campus, 15-36.

⁴⁴Sarah M. Dinham and Linda M. Evans, "Assessment and Accreditation in Professional Schools, The Review of Higher Education 14 (Winter 1991): 217-237.

⁴⁵B. M. K. Hagerty and Joan S. Stark, "Comparing Educational Standards in Selected Professional Fields," Journal of Higher Education, 60, (January-February 1989): 1-19.

and Richard Parrish⁴⁶ make observations of the relationships of multiple accreditation requirements by regional and specialized agencies on individual campuses. These relationships are also raised in the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching's report criticizing the counterbalancing and often negative effects on the institution's mission and goals.⁴⁷

Trends and Directions

There are many important trends and directions facing the accreditation process and accreditation agencies that has implications beyond simply the accreditation of colleges and universities. From student assessment to evaluation team ethics, they appear regularly in The Chronicle of Higher Education and Accreditation, the quarterly newsletter of the Council on Postsecondary Accreditation.

Specific literature includes The Control of the Campus⁴⁸ raising issues surrounding accreditation and providing proposals for improvement. Interpreted as a

⁴⁶H. R. Kells and Richard M. Parrish, Multiple Accreditation Relationships of Postsecondary Institutions in the United States, (Washington, DC: Council on Postsecondary Accreditation, 1979).

⁴⁷Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, Control of the Campus, 28-33.

⁴⁸Ibid.

possible update to the Carnegie Foundation report, Mayhew, Ford, and Hubbard⁴⁹ reinforce the value of accreditation into the 1990s and support how accreditation will continue to be an integral, important dimension of higher education.

Jerry Miller and L. E. Boswell's article⁵⁰ look at the roles of accreditation and their future uses while H. R. Kells and Patricia Thrash⁵¹ comment on the processes of accreditation and prospects for change.

The impact and increased awareness for standards of integrity and ethics has not left this culture untouched. James Huffman⁵² focused on integrity from the standpoint of the institution in self-studies and then Marjorie Lenn

⁴⁹Mayhew, Ford, and Hubbard, Quest for Quality, 209-231.

⁵⁰Jerry W. Miller and L. E. Boswell, "Accreditation, Assessment, and the Credentialing of Educational Accomplishment," Journal of Higher Education 50 (March-April 1979): 219-225.

⁵¹H. R. Kells, "The People of Institutional Accreditation: A Study of the Characteristics of Evaluation Teams and Related Aspects of the Accrediting Process," Journal of Higher Education 50 (March-April 1979): 178-198; Patricia A. Thrash, "Accreditation: A Perspective," Journal of Higher Education 50 (March-April 1979): 116-120. The March-April 1979 issue of the Journal of Higher Education was dedicated to issues facing accreditation.

⁵²James Huffman, "The Role of Accreditation in Preserving Educational Integrity," Educational Record 63 (Summer 1982): 41-44.

focused on ethics and conflicts of interest of members of accreditation agency officials and evaluation teams.⁵³

On the issue of diversity and innovation, the Winter 1986 issue of Accreditation focused on educational quality and the need for increased diversity among and between colleges and the need for innovation to forge into the future.⁵⁴

Accreditation is an important issue in higher education. Although not usually a headline news story, it is frequently blended into articles in professional newspapers, scholarly journals, and new books. A contemplative article on how accreditation has adapted to the changing times is H. J. Zoffer's article in the Winter 1987 issue of the Educational Record.⁵⁵

Military War Colleges

Professional Military Education for Officers

The literature on professional military education must begin with the Joint Chiefs of Staff Military

⁵³Marjorie P. Lenn, ed., Conflicts of Interest and the Accreditation Process, (Washington, DC: Council on Postsecondary Accreditation, 1991).

⁵⁴Accreditation 11, Winter 1986.

⁵⁵H. J. Zoffer, "Accreditation Bends Before the Winds of Change," Educational Record 68 (Winter 1987): 43-46.

Education Policy Document.⁵⁶ This policy document provides definition and context for professional military education for the officer corps across Service lines.

In addition to the policy document, there are two key works considered classics on military education. The first is John Masland and Laurence Radway's Soldiers and Scholars: Military Education and National Policy.⁵⁷ This is one of the most thorough studies on military education and provides a background for understanding the various levels of professional education. Masland and Radway's book is complemented with James Shelburne and Kenneth Groves' Education in the Armed Forces.⁵⁸ Shelburne and Groves were researchers at Air University who dedicate chapter four of their book to professional military education. The chapter provides a cross-service overview of the structure of professional military education and a breakdown of the various levels of education.

In addition to the aforementioned classics on military education, there are two additional books that

⁵⁶U.S. Joint Chiefs of Staff, Military Education Policy Document, #CM344-90 (Washington, DC: Joint Chiefs of Staff, 1990).

⁵⁷Masland and Radway, Soldiers and Scholars .

⁵⁸James C. Shelburne and Kenneth J. Groves, Education in the Armed Forces (New York: Center for Applied Research in Education, 1956).

deserve a place in this section of a literature review on military education. The first is The System for Educating Military Officers⁵⁹ an anthology collected by Lawrence Korb's with the commentary of the authors on subjects that include reviews of the senior war colleges and the attitudes of officers on education. The second book, published in 1990, is Martin van Creveld's The Training of Officers: From Military Professionalism to Irrelevance.⁶⁰ Van Creveld provides a historical perspective of military education in the United States to that of other periods of history and other countries including the former Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. He then identifies problems and makes recommendations for United States military education.

In addition to the classics on military education and Korb and van Creveld's books with commentary on the problems with military education, another document is an important link to the current trends of military education as a whole and in the micro perspective, on military war colleges. That document, known as the

⁵⁹L[awrence]. J. Korb, ed., The System for Educating Military Officers (Pittsburgh: International Studies Association, 1976).

⁶⁰Martin van Creveld, The Training of Officers: From Military Professionalism to Irrelevance (New York: The Free Press, 1990).

Skelton Report, is the result of a Congressional panel formed by the Chairman of the House of Representatives' Armed Services Committee.⁶¹ This panel was formed to review the state of professional military education and provide recommendations for the implementation of the Goldwater-Nichols Act⁶² that ensures officers are adequately prepared for joint-service positions.

There are limited journal articles on the war colleges even among military professional journals. Two appropriate articles, however, have been published in the U.S. Navy's journal, U.S. Naval Institute Proceedings, one by Edward Katzenbach and the other by R. R. Campbell.⁶³ These articles are somewhat dated yet discuss issues van Creveld raises in the 1990s. Finally, James Kitfield wrote "Schooled in Warfare," with a focus

⁶¹Congress, House, Committee on Armed Services, Panel on Military Education, Report of the Panel of Military Education, report prepared by Ike Skelton, 101st Cong., 1st sess., 21 April 1989, Committee Print 4.

⁶²The Goldwater-Nichols Act was passed by Congress in 1986 to focus professional military education at the intermediate and senior levels on joint Service strategy to prepare selected officers across service lines for positions of joint service.

⁶³Edward L. Katzbach, Jr., "The Demotion of Professionalism at the War Colleges," United States Naval Institute Proceedings 91 (March 1965): 34-41; R. R. Campbell, "Progress and Problems and the War Colleges," United States Naval Institute Proceedings 94 (September 1968): 52-59.

on linking military education with the successes in the Persian Gulf War.⁶⁴ His article is worthy of review of contemporary trends in military education; however, his article, on close inspection, misrepresents the tiers of military education.

History of Sister Service War Colleges

Each of the separate sister Service war colleges (Naval, Army, and Air War College)⁶⁵ have documented histories of their war college and the changing directions of the mission and curriculum over time. Although those authors focus on a specific war college, they make at least cursory references to the other war colleges as they affected their individual programs.

The oldest war college, the Naval War College, has a centennial history written by John Hattendorf, B. Mitchell Simpson III, and John Wadleigh in Sailors and Scholars: A Centennial History of the U.S. Naval War College.⁶⁶ This well documented source focuses on the establishment of the college and comments on its changes

⁶⁴James Kitfield, "Schooled in Warfare," Government Executive, October 1991, 22-27.

⁶⁵The Marine Corps War College was so recently chartered (1990) that its history has not been included in any of the recent publications.

⁶⁶Hattendorf, Simpson, and Wadleigh, Sailors and Scholars.

in mission, reform and refocus of the curriculum, and the effects of war on the college. The authors document changes in direction as the leadership changed. Appendix A to this book is a chronology of significant events over one hundred years that affected the Naval War College.

The Army War College is the second oldest war college which opened at Ft. Lesley J. McNair in Washington and later moved to Carlisle Barracks in Pennsylvania. Two authors have written in-depth, nearly exhaustive books on this college. George Pappas wrote Prudens Futuri: The US Army War College: 1901-1967⁶⁷ and Harry Ball wrote Of Responsible Command: A History of the U.S. Army War College.⁶⁸ Pappas and Ball wrote their books in paralleled periods and together trace the evolution of the Army War College to the mid-twentieth century.

The Air War College does not have its history in as thorough a piece as the Army or Naval War Colleges. A brief history of the Air War College, along with the other war colleges, can be found in the work by Masland

⁶⁷Pappas, Prudens Futuri.

⁶⁸Harry P. Ball, Of Responsible Command: A History of the U.S. Army War College (Carlisle Barracks, PA: The Alumni Association of the U.S. Army War College, 1983).

and Radway.⁶⁹ In addition, Richard Davis and Frank Donnini allocate approximately half of their book, Professional Military Education for Officers: Comments and Criticisms⁷⁰ on the history and evolution of Air University and includes strands of history throughout on the war college. Finally, Lawrence Short's Air University in War: The Role of Education in Wartime⁷¹ provides a brief historical perspective on Air University.

The National War College

The history of the National War College is included in much of the literature previously mentioned since it was initially designed to be at the apex of senior military education.

Like the Air War College, a single volume has not been published that is dedicated solely to the history of the National War College, however, its history can be pieced together from the National Defense University

⁶⁹Masland and Radway, Soldiers and Scholars, 144-145.

⁷⁰Richard L. Davis and Frank P. Donnini, Professional Military Education for Air Force Officers: Comments and Criticisms (Maxwell AFB, AL: Air University Press, 1991).

⁷¹Lawrence O. Short, Air University in War: The Role of Education in Wartime (Maxwell AFB, AL: Air University Press, 1985).

archives at Fort Lesley J. McNair in Washington, DC.⁷² The Archival Administrative Memoranda, Vol 1 and 2⁷³ is a bound volume with copies of the original memorandums that were sent to the National War College commandant from the Joint Chiefs of Staff and vice versa. Leslie Norton, in an unpublished paper⁷⁴ focuses on the purpose and mission of the National War College and William Hessler provides a brief look at the first ten years of the National War College in his 1957 article in the United States Naval Institute Proceedings.⁷⁵ In addition, the history of the National War College as it was related to the other war colleges was the focus of Vernon Johnson's 1983 College of William and Mary Ed.D. dissertation, Development of the National War College and Peer Institutions: A Comparative Study of the Growth and Interrelationship of

⁷²Although no single book is dedicated to the National War College, Masland and Radway's Soldiers and Scholars provides the background for the establishment of the National War College and provides a ten year history of the first years of the college.

⁷³National Defense University, Archival Administrative Memoranda, Vol 1 and 2 (Washington: DC: National Defense University, [1946-1947]).

⁷⁴Leslie M. Norton, "The Place and Purpose of the National War College in the Military Educational System of the United States," Special Collections, National Defense University Library, Washington, DC.

⁷⁵William H. Hessler, "The National War College-A Civilian Appraisal," United States Naval Institute Proceedings 82 (March 1956): 272-277.

US Military Senior Service Colleges.⁷⁶ Finally, James Keagle wrote a summary of the major activities from the beginning of the National War College to the academic year 1989-1990⁷⁷ and includes a bottom to top look at the changes in the curriculum, faculty, administration, and other areas within the National War College.

Summary

Accreditation and military war colleges on the surface may seem as diverse as night and day. However, each has classical literature, although not without limitations, to draw a historical perspective, understand the missions and purposes, and identify the current trends and directions. Specifically, the trends and directions have common ground inasmuch as the Naval War College was accredited in 1991 by the New England Association of Schools and Colleges⁷⁸ and the National

⁷⁶Vernon E. Johnson, "Development of the National War College and Peer Institutions: A Comparative Study of the Growth and Interrelationship of US Military Senior Service Colleges," Ed.D. diss., The College of William and Mary, 1982.

⁷⁷James Keagle, "A Summary of Major Activities and Their Evolution: Academic Year 1946-1947 Thru Academic Year 1989-1990," [1989], Special Collections, National Defense University Library, Washington, DC.

⁷⁸Naval War College, United States Naval War College Catalog (Newport, RI: Naval War College Press, [1991]), 7.

War College is currently undergoing the accreditation process.⁷⁹

⁷⁹Jaschik, "A College for the Next Generation of Military Leaders," A3.

CHAPTER 3

ACCREDITATION

Accreditation Defined

The accreditation process of colleges and universities in the United States is the primary communal and self-regulatory means of quality assessment and enhancement of the academic and professional communities.⁸⁰ It is a private⁸¹ voluntary process that recognizes institutions of higher education and their professional programs with an established level of performance, integrity, and quality entitling them to the confidence of the educational community and the many constituencies that they serve.⁸²

Although it is a voluntary process of self-regulation unique to higher education, the accreditation decisions have an effect on a variety of formal and informal groups. Those groups include the federal and state governments, business and industry, academics, and

⁸⁰Millard, Folger, Millett, "Institutional Mission, Quality, and Accreditation," 101.

⁸¹Private as opposed to government regulated.

⁸²Council on Postsecondary Accreditation, Directory of Recognized Accrediting Bodies, 1.

the public.⁸³ Since public and educational needs must be served simultaneously in determining and fostering standards of quality and integrity in colleges and universities, accreditation conducted through regional institutional and specialized agencies provides a venue for meeting those needs.⁸⁴

History of Accreditation

Laying the Foundation

From the colonial colleges to the mid-1800s many institutions experimented with internal controls and standardization.⁸⁵ A prelude to accreditation was introduced in 1787 when the New York State Board of Regents required that every college in the state be visited with the results reported annually to the state legislature. Since similar requirements did not exist in other states, it became necessary to develop a system of maintaining academic standards.⁸⁶

Initially, accreditation focused only on secondary

⁸³Ibid.; Miller and Boswell, "Accreditation, Assessment, and the Credentialing of Educational Accomplishment," 219-225.

⁸⁴Council on Postsecondary Accreditation, Directory, 1.

⁸⁵Selden, Accreditation, 17-20.

⁸⁶Selden and Porter, Accreditation: Its Purposes and Uses, 1.

schools. The University of Michigan adopted a system of inspecting state secondary schools in 1870. Once accredited, graduates from approved high schools could be admitted to the university without examination.⁸⁷

A movement to accredit all institutions that met minimal standards began in 1890. By 1896 the National Association of State Universities was formed with the goal of achieving common standards.⁸⁸ The movement ground-swelled by 1900 and resulted in the creation of the Association of American Universities and the Association of Land-Grant Colleges. These organizations were armed with the purpose of instilling uniform graduate standards.⁸⁹

By 1906 the National Association of State Universities, Association of American Universities, and the Association of Land-Grant Colleges sought common ground at a meeting held at Williamstown, Massachusetts and developed a new fabric of collegiate and university

⁸⁷I. L. Kandel, "Examinations and Their Substitutes," Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching Bulletin 28 (Boston: The Merrymount Press, 1936): 34-35.

⁸⁸Rudolph, The American College and University, 436-438; Veysey, The Emergence of the American University, 312-313.

⁸⁹Veysey, The Emergence of the American University, 313.

accreditation.⁹⁰ The purpose of the meetings was to bring cooperation among agencies and organizations interested in accreditation. Annual meetings were held at the New York offices of the newly created Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. The greatest contribution of the meetings was the fostering of communication and cooperation among the various organizations. In addition, the group, known as the National Conference Committee, was responsible for defining a unit that represented "a year's study in any subject in secondary school, constituting approximately a quarter of a full year's work." That unit was adopted and named the Carnegie unit.⁹¹

In 1905, the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching was formed to provide a pension fund for college faculties.⁹² To be eligible to participate in the fund, four standards were identified: an admission requirement of four years of preparatory or secondary school study, a minimum of six full-time professors, a four-year course in the arts and sciences, and a

⁹⁰Rudolph, The American College and University, 438; Selden, Accreditation, 34.

⁹¹Rudolph, The American College and University, 438.

⁹²Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, Control of the Campus, 22.

productive endowment of at least \$200,000.⁹³ These four standards essentially became the first yardstick to measure colleges in the United States.

Institutional accreditation continued to mature as colleges and schools in various regions of the country needed common standards, articulation with secondary schools, standardized transfer credit practices, and standard criterion for admittance to graduate schools. The trend expanded to include regional and specialized accreditation bodies.⁹⁴ Regional and national accreditation commissions of schools and colleges were charged to accredit total operating units or institutions. Specialized accreditation was granted by commissions on accreditation established in national professional associations for professionals such as business, dentistry, engineering, and law.⁹⁵

Regional Accreditation Organizations

The first regional accreditation organization was formed as a result of a conference between Charles Eliot,

⁹³Ibid.

⁹⁴Gloria Chernay, Accreditation and the Role of the Council on Postsecondary Accreditation (Washington, DC: Council on Postsecondary Accreditation, 1989); Young, "Accreditation: Complex Evaluative Tool," 19-35.

⁹⁵Council on Postsecondary Accreditation, Directory, 2.

president of Harvard, and the Massachusetts Classical and High School Teachers Association in 1884. The result of that meeting was the creation of the New England Association of Colleges and Schools in 1885 with the goal to "attempt in this country to bring together for the common good educators and educational institutions from the same geographical area."⁹⁶ Shortly thereafter, in 1887, the Middle States Association of Colleges and Schools was founded. It was not until 1895 that the North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools was organized to establish closer relationships with colleges and secondary schools serving the states in the mid-West of the United States.⁹⁷ The Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools of the Southern States was also founded in 1895 although accreditation standards were not adopted until 1919.⁹⁸

By 1917 the Northwest Association of Secondary and Higher Schools was established; and in 1924, the Western College Association began as an informal group of

⁹⁶Selden, Accreditation, 31.

⁹⁷Fred F. Harclerod, "Accreditation: Voluntary Enterprise," in Kenneth E. Young and others, eds., Understanding Accreditation (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1983), 36-53; McVey, "Developing Accreditation Standards," 253-256; Selden, Accreditation, 30-31.

⁹⁸Harclerod, "Accreditation," 43.

Southern California college's administrators. That group formalized and voted for accreditation in 1948.⁹⁹

Regional accreditation organizations originally emphasized college admission requirements because those requirements needed standardization.¹⁰⁰ The National Educational Association's Committee on College Entrance Requirements laid a foundation with the North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools in 1899 by establishing a commission that defined and described courses required for high school students and admission to college. In 1902, the requirements were further refined and advanced college credit for courses in secondary school was initiated.¹⁰¹ Later, the National Educational Association developed and administered standardized aptitude tests that satisfied the orderliness for college admissions.¹⁰²

Early accreditation standards were shaped by the

⁹⁹Selden, Accreditation, 31-32.

¹⁰⁰McVey, "Developing Accreditation Standards," 253-255.

¹⁰¹G. N. Carman, "Report of the Commission on Accredited Schools," in Addresses and Proceedings of the National Educational Association, Minneapolis, Minn. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1902), 500-505.

¹⁰²McVey, "Developing Accreditation Standards," 253-255; Selden, Accreditation, 32-34.

model adopted by the North Central Association in 1909.¹⁰³ The initial criteria were prescriptive and called for only quantitative data. These standards included the value of college endowments or tax support, size of the library holdings, number of academic departments, teaching loads, professional training of teachers, size of classes, and required 120 credits for graduation.¹⁰⁴ The North Central Association published its first list of accredited colleges in 1913.¹⁰⁵

The American Association of University Professors criticized that the standards were too mechanical. That association believed the standards only measured the "machinery" set up by institutions to provide education and not the quality of education, the diversity of institutions, the needs they were designed to fill, or the achievement of the students.¹⁰⁶ Thus, in the 1930s the standards were revised to evaluate colleges based on the institution's mission and educational objectives as

¹⁰³Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, Control of the Campus, 21-22.

¹⁰⁴McVey, "Developing Accreditation Standards," 253-255; Selden, Accreditation, 34-35.

¹⁰⁵Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, Control of the Campus, 24.

¹⁰⁶Cherney, Accreditation and the Role of COPA, 1-2; Reeves, "Educational Discussion," 522.

the controlling factors in assessing quality¹⁰⁷ measuring how well institutions do what their rhetoric says they do.

The North Central Association took the lead again by evaluating institutions by their missions and objectives and the contributions they make as institutions of higher education.¹⁰⁸ This new process had three aims. The first was the goal to bring greater cooperation between colleges and secondary schools. Second, the association recognized the need to consider common educational problems; and third, to promote the physical, intellectual, and moral well-being of students.¹⁰⁹ Specific areas identified by the North Central Association included the aims of the institution, control and administration, student management, faculty competence, curriculum and instructional procedures, financial efficiency, library, physical plant and equipment, students' extra-curricular activities, and institutional tone.¹¹⁰ The model of conducting self-

¹⁰⁷Cherney, Accreditation and the Role of COPA, 1.

¹⁰⁸Selden, Accreditation, 40-44.

¹⁰⁹McVey, "Developing Accreditation Standards," 253-255.

¹¹⁰Reeves, "Educational Discussion," 522-530; William K. Selden, "Accrediting--What Is It?" American Association of University Professors Bulletin 42

studies was conceptualized by the Middle States Association after World War II and included revisits to member institutions on a ten year cycle.¹¹¹

From 1932 to 1939, the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching examined many aspects of the accreditation process in their annual reports. In 1938, concerns that accrediting agencies had confused aims surfaced.¹¹² One area of concern was that accreditation focused on an institution's duty to their teachers, administrative employees, and the local community but did not address the college student who does not get a quality education for the money spent or a quality return for the expenditure of his or her adolescent years. Another issue was standardization of academic degrees, yet there was disagreement on which degrees were to be standardized and what a liberal arts degree was to symbolize.¹¹³

In 1939, the Carnegie Foundation identified three groups who sought appraisals of educational quality. Identified were individuals responsible for operating

(December 1956): 629-635.

¹¹¹Selden, Accreditation, 41.

¹¹²Reed, "Origins of Licensing," 1938, p. 76.

¹¹³Ibid.

the institution, those who plan to join an institution as a teacher or student, and individuals or organizations who sought to use the services (researchers or students) of an educational institution.¹¹⁴

Many nonprofit voluntary groups such as the American Association of University Women and the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching maintained lists of accredited institutions. The most prominent listing was published from 1914 to 1947 by the Association of American Universities. Finding that task cumbersome, the Association of American Universities discontinued publishing the list in 1948, leaving a void in compiling who was accredited.¹¹⁵

When the Association of American Universities discontinued publishing lists in 1948, 53% of the colleges and universities in the United States were accredited by regional associations.¹¹⁶ The regional associations banded together and formed a voluntary organization, the National Committee on Regional Accrediting Agencies, and produced a joint list of regionally accredited institutions. The National

¹¹⁴Reed, "Accrediting Agencies," 1939, p. 29-44.

¹¹⁵Harclerod, "Accreditation," 36-53.

¹¹⁶Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, Control of the Campus, 25.

Committee on Regional Accrediting Agencies was replaced in 1964 by the Federation of Regional Accrediting Commissions of Higher Education. The Federation initiated the development of common policy statements for accreditation agencies and sought to harmonize differences in regional standards. The Federation was dissolved in 1975 and a new organization, the Council of Postsecondary Accreditation, was formed and remains in existence today.¹¹⁷

Despite marked diversities among the regional associations, they shared four major purposes of accreditation through the mid-1900s. Admissions and the maintenance of minimum academic standards were the two initial issues that faced regional associations. As more colleges and universities were accredited, increased emphasis was placed on stimulating institutional improvement. The fourth purpose was to serve as a countervailing force to the many external and some internal pressures exerted on educational institutions, especially social and economic pressures.¹¹⁸

Those four major purposes of accreditation shifted in the 1950s and 1960s as the higher education enterprise

¹¹⁷Harcleroad, "Accreditation," 36-53.

¹¹⁸Selden, Accreditation, 42-43.

evolved. The first critical issue was the claim that higher education should become intrinsically more significant, especially values, beliefs, and standards of personal conduct. The second issue involved the need for institutions to discover ways of self-renewal to cope with the exponential increases in the amount of knowledge. The third was deciding who should go to college; and the fourth was identifying what quality education was and how it was to be achieved. The fifth issue was how to remove barriers to higher education, such as race, religion, geography, and finance, while maintaining quality.¹¹⁹

While shifts in higher education modified accreditation, it also brought about several critics of the accreditation process between 1939 and 1950. Brumbaugh identified six major faults in the accreditation system.¹²⁰ He concluded:

1. There are too many accrediting agencies.
2. This results in a duplication of functions.
3. Accrediting agencies are destroying individual rights and freedom and usurping the powers vested in governing boards.

¹¹⁹Mayhew, Ford, and Hubbard, Quest for Quality, 212-213.

¹²⁰Brumbaugh, "The Accrediting Agencies Face Their Common Problems," 59-60.

4. Costs levied are excessive. This applies to time, money, and extra burdens placed upon the staffs of the institutions.

5. Standards are quantitative and superficial. This tends to put institutions in a strait jacket and discourages educational experimentation.

6. Outside groups (i.e., professional and vocational groups) dominate the accrediting procedures and standards are frequently exclude representation of educational all interests.¹²¹

During this period, some academicians believed that accreditation had served its purpose of protecting society from fraudulent institutions and the task was complete. Others argued for continued accrediting activities because the remedy was not the abandonment of accreditation, but in the adoption of strong measures to correct the problems and maintain continuous improvement.¹²²

Colleges and universities were accredited through a process of evaluations by a visiting team of educators selected from college presidents and administrators of other institutions, a process still in use today. Revisits to accredited institutions were scheduled ranging in time from three to seven, or even ten years. A written report or summary of conclusions was provided

¹²¹Ibid.

¹²²Ibid., 59-61.

for the benefit of deciding if the institution would receive accreditation as well as to assist the college in its own steps for self-improvement.¹²³

Specialized Accreditation

Specialized accreditation has been a part of accreditation in the United States for nearly as long as regional accreditation. Many professions became concerned about the quality of educational programs that were preparing its practitioners. The primary goal of specialized accreditation is to foster excellence through the development of criteria and guidelines for assessing it.¹²⁴ Another purpose, among some professions, is to link accreditation and licensure.¹²⁵ Despite its overall similarity to regional accreditation, specialized accreditation processes and practices differ for various professional fields of study on several dimensions. For example, the nature of the accrediting body, the defined purposes of accreditation, the degree of institutional investment in seeking external review, the impact of accreditation status on the program and its graduates,

¹²³Selden, "Accrediting--What Is It?" 629-635.

¹²⁴Selden, Accreditation, 56-58.

¹²⁵Hagerty and Stark, "Comparing Educational Accreditation Standards," 1-19.

and the types of designated standards.¹²⁶

Medical colleges were the first professional schools to receive specialized accreditation. When the American Medical Association was created in 1847, the doctor of medicine degree was awarded for less than six months of study plus some apprenticeship, and standards for admission requirements were practically nonexistent.¹²⁷

One of the first acts of the American Medical Association was appointment of a committee on medical education. By 1900, 26 states had instituted licensure requirements for medical school graduates.¹²⁸

The Council on Medical Education of the American Medical Association published its first list of classified schools in 1906-1907, but it was not until the release of the 1910 Flexner Report that stimulated the closing of deficient schools.¹²⁹ The Flexner Report severely criticized medical education and advocated that medical schools be incorporated as organic departments of universities, proprietary schools be eliminated, the

¹²⁶Ibid.

¹²⁷Selden, Accreditation, 57.

¹²⁸Robert Glidden, "Specialized Accreditation," in Kenneth E. Young and others, eds., Understanding Accreditation (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1983), 188.

¹²⁹Selden, Accreditation, 57-58.

requirement of basic scientific courses be taught by full-time faculty members, and teaching hospitals be used for clinical experience. The report had considerable impact. Of the 160 medical schools in 1905, seventy-five were closed by 1920.¹³⁰

Selden concluded "the progress of medical school evaluation was the most outstanding single feature of the history of professional education in the United States during this period and it can also be claimed that accrediting had much to do with this progress."¹³¹

Professional accreditation grew to include law degree programs in 1900; and by 1920, the list included ten programs.¹³² By 1956, there were more than 20 agencies accrediting professional degree programs including architecture, business, chemistry, dentistry, design, engineering, forestry, journalism, law, library science, medicine, music, nursing, optometry, pharmacy, psychology, public health, social work, teacher education, and veterinary medicine.¹³³ Today there are more than 50 specialized accreditation agencies, an

¹³⁰Ibid, 58; Glidden, "Specialized Accreditation," 187-190.

¹³¹Selden, Accreditation, 58.

¹³²Glidden, "Specialized Accreditation," 187-190.

¹³³Selden, "Accrediting--What Is It?" 629-635.

outgrowth of the increasing specialization of disciplines across college curricula.¹³⁴

Professional accrediting began with a noble purpose, "to establish on a national basis, educational standards and practices that assures minimum competency of graduates of accredited schools."¹³⁵ The controversy of what endorsement resulted from professional accreditation caused Alfred Reed of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching to make a clarification between accreditation, licensure, and chartering in 1937.¹³⁶ He concluded that individual practitioners are "licensed," while the institution that prepares them are "accredited."¹³⁷ However, Reed recognized that licensing implies a prerogative of government. When private agencies exercise similar functions, whether by conferring titles or degrees, a more appropriate description is "professional recognition."¹³⁸ Similarly, when government applies its power of

¹³⁴Hagerty and Stark, "Comparing Educational Accreditation Standards," 1-19.

¹³⁵Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, Control of the Campus, 28-33.

¹³⁶Reed, "Professional Recognition, Accountability, and Licensure," 41-63.

¹³⁷Ibid.

¹³⁸Ibid.

compulsion to educational institutions rather than to individuals, it does not accredit or license the institutions. It "charters" them.¹³⁹ Regardless of the terminology used, accreditation by private or public agencies has an advisory force. Government, on the other hand, may choose to make its own list, or use another's to exercise restrictive action.¹⁴⁰

When professional bodies began accrediting colleges and universities, a powerful new force was added to the informal governance structure of higher education.¹⁴¹ Yet, one of the chief causes of tension between institutional leaders and specialized accreditation is the question of who is being served by the accreditation process, the institution or the profession.¹⁴² This delicate balance will continue as an area of concern into the future.

Governmental Influence

The federal government has clearly impacted the role and use of accreditation although the U.S. Constitution

¹³⁹Ibid.

¹⁴⁰Ibid.

¹⁴¹Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, Control of the Campus, 38.

¹⁴²Glidden, "Specialized Accreditation," 193.

does not provide for a direct role by the federal government in education.¹⁴³ In 1867, Congress provided for the organization of a National Department of Education; the following year this Department became the Bureau of Education. Later, the organization underwent another name change to the Office of Education.¹⁴⁴ It then became a joint cabinet-level department in 1953 and a separate department in 1979.¹⁴⁵

In 1910 with the appointment of a Specialist in Higher Education by Congress, colleges and universities were rated as "good/better/best" based on a single criterion, the success of graduates of individual colleges in master's degree programs.¹⁴⁶ So much criticism arose that President William Howard Taft requested that the list be withheld¹⁴⁷ and his successor, President Woodrow Wilson also declined to

¹⁴³Selden and Porter, Accreditation: Its Purposes and Uses, 1.

¹⁴⁴McVey, "Developing Accreditation Standards," 253-255.

¹⁴⁵U.S. News and World Report, 1984 World Almanac and Book of Facts (New York: Newspaper Enterprise Association, 1983), 300.

¹⁴⁶Charles M. Chambers, "Federal Government and Accreditation," in Kenneth E. Young and others, eds., Understanding Accreditation (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1983), 236-237; Selden, Accreditation, 46.

¹⁴⁷Selden, Accreditation, 46-47.

publish the list.¹⁴⁸ By 1913, the list was eliminated and never again did the United States Office of Education exercise its own judgement in evaluating and classifying educational institutions.

Following the 1911-1913 episode, from 1917 through 1952, the Office of Education issued a publication, "Accredited Higher Institutions," of institutions accredited by the states and recognized regional and professional accrediting agencies every four years.¹⁴⁹

Since World War II, the federal government's interest and involvement in accreditation reached astonishing proportions partly as a result of the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1944 or "G.I. Bill." That Act was designed to help veterans get established or reestablished in a productive career.¹⁵⁰ The G.I. Bill required that the Commissioner of Education publish "a list of nationally recognized accrediting agencies and associations which he determines to be [a] reliable authority [on] the quality of training offered

¹⁴⁸Chambers, "Federal Government and Accreditation," 236-237.

¹⁴⁹Selden, Accreditation, 47-48.

¹⁵⁰Chambers, "Federal Government and Accreditation," 244-254; Kerr, Uses of the University, 52; Selden, Accreditation, 47-48.

by an educational institution."¹⁵¹ However, the Veteran's Administration was given carte blanche to use the list prepared by each state or approve institutions themselves.¹⁵²

Two key policies changed with the passage of the 1952 Korean G.I. Bill. Under the 1944 bill, institutions were reimbursed directly by the Veteran's Administration. That practice changed to reimbursing the veteran directly as it is today.¹⁵³ The change was made because Congress believed students would shop for the best educational opportunity demanding that a dollar's worth of education was received for every dollar spent.¹⁵⁴

After much debate between the American Council of Education, the American Legion, and the Veteran's Administration, Congress turned to the states to have them conduct an improved approval process of postsecondary educational institutions operating in the state because of Congress' concern for "fly-by-night"

¹⁵¹Selden, Accreditation, 47-48.

¹⁵²Chambers, "Federal Government and Accreditation," 239.

¹⁵³Ibid.

¹⁵⁴Ibid.

programs¹⁵⁵ seeking federal educational funds.

Accreditation Today

Methodology of the Accreditation Process

The principle instruments of accreditation are the fulfilling of eligibility requirements for membership. The first step is completion of a rigorous and candid institutional self-study.¹⁵⁶ The most common type of self-study is a comprehensive study that includes a historical overview of recent developments in the institution's history and compilation of various data for a profile of the institution's mission, finances, enrollment, faculty, library holdings, curricula, and extra-curricular activities.¹⁵⁷

The second stage is an on-site visit by a team of academicians, under the authority of the regional accreditation agency. The site team is selected among academicians who have knowledge peculiar to the type of

¹⁵⁵Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, Control of the Campus, 23-27; Chambers, "Federal Government and Accreditation," 240; M. W. Finkin, Federal Reliance on Educational Accreditation (Washington, DC: Council on Postsecondary Accreditation, 1978).

¹⁵⁶Cherney, Accreditation and the Role of COPA, 5; Mayhew, Ford, and Hubbard, Quest for Quality, 214.

¹⁵⁷Mayhew, Ford, and Hubbard, Quest for Quality, 214-215.

institution visited.¹⁵⁸ The evaluation team generally spends one and one-half to three days meeting with administrators, faculty, and students to form impressions about the institution. The visiting team provides an evaluation report which is reviewed by the institution or program for factual accuracy. That report is also the primary vehicle used to determine whether the institution receives membership into the accreditation body.¹⁵⁹

Regional accreditation agencies accredited institutions with varying degrees of skepticism. Accreditation bodies have the option of requiring interim reports at the end of a specified period of time somewhat less than the normal interval to provide an updated commentary on the condition of an institution.¹⁶⁰

From its inception, the accreditation process has been the target of criticism. Far too often, the claims and criticisms are based on personal biases, isolated incidents, or rumors of what happened when an evaluation team visited an institution than on an objective and comprehensive examination of any or all of the accredited

¹⁵⁸Ibid.

¹⁵⁹Cherney, Accreditation and the Role of COPA, 5; Mayhew, Ford, and Hubbard, Quest for Quality, 218-219.

¹⁶⁰Mayhew, Ford, and Hubbard, Quest for Quality, 220.

operation.¹⁶¹

Regional Accreditation Associations

The regional accreditation associations that are currently recognized by the Council on Postsecondary Accreditation are listed in the table below.¹⁶²

Accreditation Body	Institutions In:
Middle States Association of Colleges and Schools	Delaware, District of Columbia, Maryland, New Jersey, New York and Pennsylvania
New England Association of Schools and Colleges	Connecticut, Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Rhode Island, and Vermont
North Central Association of Colleges and Schools	Arizona, Colorado, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, New Mexico, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, South Dakota, West Virginia, Wisconsin, and Wyoming
Northwest Association of Schools and Colleges	Alaska, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, Oregon, Utah, and Washington
Southern Association of Colleges and Schools	Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, and Virginia
Western Association of Schools and Colleges	California and Hawaii

¹⁶¹D. G. Peterson, "Accrediting Standards and Guidelines: A Profile," Educational Record 29 (1978): 305-313.

¹⁶²Council on Postsecondary Accreditation, Directory, 11-15.

New and Improved Roles?

The importance of accreditation has increased since the 1970s.¹⁶³ Colleges and universities must be accountable to the society that created them, supports them, and gives them their rationale for existing. Accreditation provides the foundation for that accountability.¹⁶⁴ Toward that end, the Council on Postsecondary Accreditation is charged to ensure uniformity of accrediting policy, procedures, and practices by promoting, improving, and ensuring the quality of American postsecondary education.¹⁶⁵ Other roles include balancing the interests of accrediting bodies, institutions, and the public; to protect the integrity of the accrediting community; to protect the public interest; and to mediate federal and state concerns about accreditation.¹⁶⁶

The Council on Postsecondary Accreditation identifies the following primary purposes of the

¹⁶³Selden and Porter, Accreditation: Its Purposes and Uses, 4.

¹⁶⁴Melvin D. George and Larry A. Braskamp, "Universities, Accountability, and the Uncertainty Principle," Educational Record 59 (Fall 1978): 345-366.

¹⁶⁵Cherney, Accreditation and the Role of COPA, 9; Mayhew, Ford, and Hubbard, Quest for Quality, 222-224.

¹⁶⁶Cherney, Accreditation and the Role of COPA, 9-12.

accreditation process:

1. Foster excellence in postsecondary education through the development of criteria and guidelines for assessing educational effectiveness.
2. Encourage improvement through continuous self-study and review.
3. Assures the educational community, the general public, and other agencies that an institution has clearly defined and educationally appropriate objectives, maintains conditions under which their achievement can reasonably be expected, is in fact accomplishing them substantially, and can be expected to continue to do so.¹⁶⁷

Accreditation provides service to several constituencies: the public, students, institutions of higher education, and the professions.¹⁶⁸ The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching concluded that accreditation is a critically important part of academic governance.¹⁶⁹ Specifically, the Council on Postsecondary Accreditation has identified specific values of accreditation to each of the various constituencies.

To the public, the values of accreditation provide an assurance of external evaluation of the institution or

¹⁶⁷Council on Postsecondary Accreditation, Directory, 4.

¹⁶⁸Council on Postsecondary Accreditation, The Role and Value of Accreditation; Thrash, "Accreditation," 16-18.

¹⁶⁹Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, Control of the Campus, 76.

program and it's conformity to general expectations in higher education or the professional field.¹⁷⁰ Accreditation agencies should develop clearly defined categories of institutional membership that are consistent from one region to another so the public can best understand the accreditation status of each institution.¹⁷¹ That identification should include that institutions have voluntarily undertaken explicit activities at improving the quality of their institution and reflecting the changes in knowledge and practice accepted in the field. Further, accreditation decreases the need for intervention by public agencies to assure educational quality.¹⁷²

Students are assured that the educational activities of an accredited institution or program have been found to be satisfactory and meet the prerequisites for entering a specific profession.¹⁷³ Of all the functions served by accreditation, perhaps none is more important

¹⁷⁰Council on Postsecondary Accreditation, The Role and Value of Accreditation, (Washington, DC: Council on Postsecondary Accreditation, 15 April 1982).

¹⁷¹Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, Control of the Campus, 77.

¹⁷²Council on Postsecondary Accreditation, The Role and Value of Accreditation, passim.

¹⁷³Ibid.

to the individual than the validation of the certificates, diplomas, degrees, and credits by an institution.¹⁷⁴ In addition, students can be assured that transfers of credits or admission to graduate studies is assisted through the general acceptance of credits among accredited institutions.¹⁷⁵

Accreditation is the stimulus for self-evaluation and voluntary institutional and program improvement in higher education. The application of the criteria of accreditation bodies help guard against external encroachments harmful to institutional or program quality by providing benchmarks independent of forces that might impinge on individual institutions.¹⁷⁶ Accreditation agencies should also hold campuses accountable for good management, enlightened personnel practices, and consumer protection, especially those areas of special concern to state and federal agencies and the courts.¹⁷⁷ Institutions can value the reputation that accreditation

¹⁷⁴Miller and Boswell, "Accreditation, Assessment, and the Credentialing of Educational Accomplishment," 219-225.

¹⁷⁵Council on Postsecondary Accreditation, The Role and Value of Accreditation, passim.

¹⁷⁶Ibid.

¹⁷⁷Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, Control of the Campus, 77.

affords them and gain eligibility for the participation of itself and its students in certain programs of governmental aid.¹⁷⁸

Finally, accreditation serves the individual professions by providing a way for the participation of practitioners in setting the requirements for preparation to enter the profession. Accreditation also contributes to the unity of professions by bringing together practitioners, teachers, and students in an activity directed at improving professional preparation and professional practice.¹⁷⁹ Academics should actively participate in the accreditation process. The Carnegie Foundation suggested that serving on an accreditation team should be the equivalent of jury duty for every academic.¹⁸⁰

Another role that has become a sensitive area by accreditation agencies is student assessment. In fact, student assessment was initially an item of discussion in 1938 at the annual meeting of the Carnegie Foundation for

¹⁷⁸Council on Postsecondary Accreditation Board, The Role and Value of Accreditation, passim; Thrash, "Accreditation," 115-120.

¹⁷⁹Ibid; Dinham and Evans, "Assessment and Accreditation in Professional Schools," 217-237.

¹⁸⁰Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, Control of the Campus, 77.

the Advancement of Teaching.¹⁸¹ However, it has taken fifty years before the concern of assessing student outcomes became a "burning" issue in accreditation. According to a 1978 survey of 208 colleges and universities that engaged in institutional self-studies in preparation for accreditation visits, only 33% had generated or examined data on their student's learning and growth.¹⁸² The 1980s and 1990s have brought about a major change with a focus on student assessment and outcomes. Student assessment is a labyrinth all its own. Therefore, assessment is discussed very broadly here.

To improve educational integrity, greater emphasis must be put on assessing educational outcomes. In other words, judge what is being accomplished at institutions in the accrediting process.¹⁸³ One problem of the past is that the study of outcomes was linked to inputs and outputs. Evaluations were measured in areas such as the number of Ph.D.s on the faculty, faculty-student ratios,

¹⁸¹Reed, "Origins of Licensing in the Learned Profession," 1938, p. 76.

¹⁸²Mayhew, Ford, and Hubbard, Quest for Quality, 218.

¹⁸³Steven M. Jung, The Role of Accreditation in Directly Improving Educational Integrity (Washington, DC: Council of Postsecondary Accreditation, 1986), 2-3; Patricia A. Thrash, "Educational Outcomes in the Accrediting Process," Academe, July-August 1978, 16-18.

and extra-curricular programs. The valid tests of outcomes should be measured by answering two key questions: "What happens in the development of students" and "how do persons change and grow as a result of their college experience?"¹⁸⁴

Student assessment should be linked to all the major goals of education. Howard Bowen suggested five goals of interest to most institutions. They include:

1. Cognitive development of students, including verbal and quantitative skills, substantive, knowledge, rationality, critical thinking, intellectual tolerance, and lifelong learning.
2. Aesthetic sensibility.
3. Emotional and moral development, including personal self-discovery, human understanding, religious interest, psychological well-being.
4. Practical competence relating to citizenship, economic productivity, family life, consumption, leisure, and health.
5. Direct satisfactions and enjoyment from college education during the college years and in later life.¹⁸⁵

In addition to desired student outcomes, however, an institution should be on the look-out for negative outcomes such as discouragement, boredom, suppression of

¹⁸⁴Howard R. Bowen, "Goals, Outcomes, and Academic Evaluation," in Alexander W. Astin, Howard R. Bowen, and Charles M. Chambers, eds., Evaluating Educational Quality: A Conference Summary (Washington, DC: Council on Postsecondary Accreditation, 1979), 19-28.

¹⁸⁵Ibid., 23.

creativity, acquisition of bad habits, needless failure, and even suicide.¹⁸⁶

Outcomes assessment based on the study of alumni as well as students is needed. Academicians should be interested in the values and attitudes of alumni, their interests, their citizenship, and family life, and their careers as they may have been affected by their college experience.¹⁸⁷ The relationship between academic success (as measured by goals and degrees) and adult achievement has been weak in the past. Society holds the view that higher education improves one's chances of achievement and success in adulthood, but the evidence calls this assumption into question.¹⁸⁸

Developing and implementing systems for assessing students is a difficult task that requires large amounts of institutional resources.¹⁸⁹ Carefully conducted assessment should occur before and after every program in an institution. In the long run, the amount of student outcome will prove well worth the effort and resources.

¹⁸⁶Ibid.

¹⁸⁷Ibid, 25.

¹⁸⁸Huffman, "The Role of Accreditation in Preserving Educational Integrity," 41-44.

¹⁸⁹Ibid., 44; Bowen, "Goals, Outcomes, and Academic Evaluation," 27.

Accrediting agencies must be in the forefront, moving colleges and universities toward demonstrating more effectively the impact they have on students.¹⁹⁰

Criticisms and Trends

The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching identified that the review process is little more than an empty ritual.¹⁹¹ Mayhew, Ford, and Hubbard also called the self-studies a ritual rather than a serious effort to produce substantive change.¹⁹² They added that even the comprehensive self-studies were long on description and short on analysis and appraisal.¹⁹³

In the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching's The Control of the Campus: A Report on the Governance of Higher Education, a concern that many campuses downplay the importance of accreditation visits was raised.¹⁹⁴ That concern was qualified by observations that higher education administrators and

¹⁹⁰Huffman, "The Role of Accreditation," 44.

¹⁹¹Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, Control of the Campus, 76.

¹⁹²Mayhew, Ford, and Hubbard, Quest for Quality, 218.

¹⁹³Ibid.

¹⁹⁴Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, Control of the Campus, 76.

other leaders frequently decline to participate in the process and that college and university heads have been frequent critics of accreditation and accrediting agencies. Further, institutional commitment and involvement have been in the form of busy work, self-defeating the accreditation process resulting in little meaning to the individuals and even less value to the institution.¹⁹⁵

Frederick Crosson noted that the faculty need to take a more active role in the accreditation process.¹⁹⁶ The faculty had a responsibility to its present and future students and the larger society to take a serious role in the quality of the educational enterprise. Institutions have ignored their local talent [faculty] and experience, turning instead to costly consultants for advice and assessment that could be better provided by their own people.¹⁹⁷

In addition to the faculty, the senior administrators of colleges and universities need to fully

¹⁹⁵Robert Kirkwood, "Institutional Responsibilities in Accreditation," Educational Record 59 (Fall 1978): 297-313.

¹⁹⁶Frederick J. Crosson, "The Role of Faculty in Accreditation," Academe, July-August 1978, 19-22.

¹⁹⁷Kirkwood, "Institutional Responsibilities in Accreditation," 299-300.

support their accrediting associations and participate actively in their work. Further, the information about the accreditation of colleges should be more accessible to the public. It is recommended that a summary of the results of each campus evaluation, excluding confidential personnel information, should be available to all concerned constituencies.¹⁹⁸

Another controversy is the purpose of specialized accreditation and its processes.¹⁹⁹ Specialized accreditation agencies claim to serve the needs of their respective professional fields by assuring program quality, programs with negotiation leverage, inter-institutional communication, and enhances the prestige and credibility of the professional program.²⁰⁰

The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching reported that specialized accreditation agencies often threaten the integrity of campuses.²⁰¹ The primary concern is that the evaluation teams impose requirements that undermine the priorities of

¹⁹⁸Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, Control of the Campus, 77.

¹⁹⁹Hagerty and Stark, "Comparing Educational Accreditation Standards," 1-19.

²⁰⁰Ibid; Selden, Accreditation, 56.

²⁰¹Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, Control of the Campus, 28-33.

institutions dictating policies such as faculty hiring (credentials) and budget allocation. In addition, as a result of its frequent linkage to licensure, specialized accreditation needs drift from the larger purposes of the campus. The Carnegie Foundation concluded that the role of occupational licensure should be to certify results; not to control the process of education.²⁰²

Hagerty and Stark²⁰³ concluded that although specialized accreditation agencies state they attach strong importance to student outcomes, few specialized agencies have made those outcomes explicit in their standards. Agencies are more concerned with the institution's mission, faculty, governance, resources, and facilities. Dinham and Evans²⁰⁴ showed equal concern with the limited emphasis on the assessment of professional fields in undergraduate education.

The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching proposed the following recommendations to fit specialized accreditation more effectively into the overall governance of higher education:

²⁰²Ibid.

²⁰³Hagerty and Stark, "Comparing Educational Accreditation," 1-19.

²⁰⁴Dinham and Evans, "Assessment and Accreditation in Professional Schools," 223-225.

1. Standards for specialized accreditation should focus on outcomes, and campus evaluations should be conducted with full respect for the overall mission of the institution.
2. Colleges and universities should not invite to campus any specialized agency whose criteria for membership are so intrusive or detailed as to weaken an institution's own authority over teaching and research.
3. Specialized accreditation teams should coordinate their visits with regional associations, and, whenever possible, such collaboration should involve sharing information and preparing combined summary reports.
4. State governments should reexamine the link between occupational licensing and specialized accreditation. In some cases, alternate routes to licensure, such as formal examinations or practical experience should be provided. In other cases, the link between licensing and accreditation should be broken altogether.²⁰⁵

A final controversy is one plaguing leaders of government and business. Conflicts of interest and questions of ethics has become a hot topic in our society. Policy makers of the Council on Postsecondary Accreditation, along with many regional and specialized agencies, focused on reducing conflicts of interest at a symposium in January 1991.²⁰⁶

General definitions of conflicts of interest generally suggest having private interests that compete

²⁰⁵Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, Control of the Campus, 78-79.

²⁰⁶Lenn, Conflicts of Interest, 5.

with official actions or duties. Since the accreditation community functions in the interest of the public and must be concerned about the actions and decisions of those in positions of trust²⁰⁷ including staff members of accreditation agencies and members of visiting committees on accreditation.

Over the past decade, members of accreditation agencies and visiting teams have used their positions to gain new jobs or improperly guide the accreditation process. Often, the conflict of interest was not an intentional action to gain special treatment or was simply a perception of a conflict of interest.²⁰⁸

Unfortunately, the incidence of reported conflicts of interest in accreditation agencies have grown in frequency and have forced accreditation bodies to publish guidelines and policies to guide future decision-making related to violations of conflicts of interest. Included in the statements defining conflicts of interest were: to avoid the appearance of a conflict of interest; to assure

²⁰⁷Patricia P. Evans, "Conflict of Interest: An Overview," in Marjorie P. Lenn, ed., Conflicts of Interest and the Accreditation Process (Washington, DC: Council on Postsecondary Accreditation, 1991), 7-9.

²⁰⁸Patricia P. Evans, "Conflict of Interest: Policies and Practices in the Accreditation Community," in Marjorie P. Lenn, ed., Conflicts of Interest and the Accreditation Process (Washington, DC: Council on Postsecondary Accreditation, 1991), 25-44.

opinions are free of self-interest or personal bias; to assure fair and impartial judgement; to avoid relationships that might bias the actions, deliberations, or decisions of the commission; to act impartially and avoid even the appearance of impropriety; and to avoid circumstances that interfere with an individual's capacity to make objective, detached decisions.²⁰⁹

Other samples of conflict identified by accreditation bodies included: current affiliation with an institution, previous affiliation with an institution, current or prior service as a consultant to the institution, a student or graduate of the institution, or a relative with a relationship to the institution.²¹⁰

Action taken by the various accreditation agencies on conflicts of interest are as varied as the accreditation bodies themselves. Needed attention has heightened awareness to this area of controversy. Establishing policy statements, formal policies to help avoid misunderstanding, and officials acting in good faith, the accreditation community hopes to continue providing quality assessment assuring its constituents that decision-making groups are comprised of financially

²⁰⁹Ibid, 31-37.

²¹⁰Ibid.

and personally disinterested individuals.²¹¹

Conclusion

In the short history of accreditation in the United States, the accreditation community has evolved into a complex process that plays a distinct and significant role in American higher education. Although nongovernmental in its present function and authority, it serves many important public uses.

Through the evolution of accreditation in the United States, the benefits of accreditation portrayed by William Selden and Harry Porter in 1977 remain as relevant as they did in 1906. Those purposes were:

1. Identifying institutions and/or programs of study that meet minimum standards.
2. Stimulating the raising of standards, and the related activity of encouraging educational improvement.
3. Assisting in the protection of institutions and/or programs of study against internal or external deleterious forces.²¹²

H. J. Zoefter, past president of the American Assembly of Collegiate Schools of Business, provides a thoughtful view of the future for accreditation. He said:

²¹¹Ibid, 36-37.

²¹²Selden and Porter, Accreditation: Its Purposes and Uses, 17.

Accreditation need not be a monster nor a panacea. It should reflect a constantly changing process of self-assessment, peer review, and compliance with minimum standards for certification. It should be a flexible and responsive mechanism for encouraging institutions to develop new initiatives. It should stress accountability to society. Accreditation has a future, particularly if it addresses the issues facing higher education today. If accreditation can keep its critics at bay by being responsive and its supporters on board by being cost-effective, it should outlast even those who dare to critique it.²¹³

²¹³Zoffer, "Accreditation Bends Before the Winds of Change," 46.

CHAPTER 4

THE NATIONAL WAR COLLEGE

Ernest Lynton and Sandra Elman identified that the higher education enterprise within the federal government, especially within the armed forces, is an area that adds to the diversity of the educational community however, it is one that needs more understanding by academicians.²¹⁴ The Naval War College, Army War College, and the Industrial College of the Armed Forces were joined in 1946 by two additional military war colleges. The new war colleges were the Air War College at Maxwell Air Force Base in Montgomery, Alabama²¹⁵ and the National War College which opened at the Army War College Post in Washington, DC.²¹⁶

This chapter provides a basis for understanding the

²¹⁴Lynton and Elman, New Priorities for the University, 103.

²¹⁵Air University, Air War College Bulletin: 1990-1991, 1.

²¹⁶The post was not renamed Fort Lesley J. McNair until 1948, see "A Chronological History from Turkey Buzzard Point to Fort Lesley J. McNair," Verticle File: Ft McNair-Chronology, Special Collections, National Defense University Library, Washington, DC; Truman R. Strobridge, "The Joint Chiefs of Staff and the Joint Education System: 1943-1986, 1988," Washington, DC: U.S. Joint Chiefs of Staff.

National War College; its location, history, mission, administration, curriculum, and size and constituency of the student body and faculty will be included.

Location and History of the National War College

Location

The National War College is located on Fort Lesley J. McNair near the junction of the Anacostia and Potomac Rivers and is close to the geographic center of Washington, DC.²¹⁷ Housed in one building, it is located at the south end of the this Army installation. The history of the National War College spans nearly half a century, however, the building can be traced back to nearly twice that period.

The Building of a War College

The plans for an Army war college were drafted in 1901 following a proposal to create a war college by the Secretary of War and creator of the General Staff of the Army, Elihu Root. On 30 June 1902, a building for the college was authorized by Congress²¹⁸ with the passage of the General Staff Act.²¹⁹ At the Washington Barracks

²¹⁷Masland and Radway, Soldiers and Scholars, 320.

²¹⁸Carroll Kilpatrick, "Tomorrow's Leaders Learn Their Trade," Nation's Business, April 1955, 58.

²¹⁹Pappas, Prudens Futuri, 28.

in Washington, DC on 21 February 1903 and according to Masonic rites,²²⁰ the trowel used by President George Washington to lay the cornerstone of the Capitol on 18 September 1793 was used to lay the cornerstone of the Army War College. President Theodore Roosevelt, Secretary of State John Hay, and Elihu Root were among those present at the cornerstone-laying ceremony.²²¹

The building was designed by well-known architects of the time, McKim, Mead, and White. Charles McKim was a member of the United States Senate Park Commission or McMillian Commission in 1901.²²² The building was then constructed under the supervision of McKim, Mead and White by the United States Army Corps of Engineers in four years at a total cost of \$700,000. It was formally

²²⁰Ibid., 28-29. According to Pappas, the ceremony was scheduled for Washington's birthday, 22 February 1902, however, the date was moved up one day because the 22d fell on a Sunday. The Grand Master that participated in the ceremony was from the Masonic Grand Lodge of the District of Columbia.

²²¹U.S. National War College, "Official Ceremony Commemorating the National War College Building as a National Historic Landmark program, 24 June 1974," Special Collections, National Defense University Library, Washington, DC; Pappas, Prudens Futuri, 28-29. The program from the National Defense University archives uses the word gavel and Pappas uses the word trowel to describe the tool used to lay the cornerstone.

²²²National War College, "Official Ceremony Commemorating the National War College Building as a National Historic Landmark Program, 24 June 1974."

dedicated by Secretary of State Eihu Root on 9 November 1908.²²³ In a review circa 1908, Frank Bauskett described the building as one of the best designs of McKim, Mead, and White.²²⁴

Described by Bauskett as Roman basilica style, the National War College building is 250 feet long and 125 feet deep and was constructed of red Pompeian pressed brick, laid in Flemish bond, with ornamentation of limestone.²²⁵ The roof was made of dark slate. The center of the front facade is the main entrance, a pavilion of a pedimental gable with massive piers on either side and proportioned Ionic columns in the center, supporting an entablature above which is a semi-circular opening. In the center of the opening is an emblematic American eagle. The design of the entrance pavilion is duplicated at the opposite end of the building.²²⁶

Bauskett's description also concluded that great

²²³Ibid.

²²⁴Frank N. Bauskett, "The War College at Washington, 1907(?)," Special Collections (NWC Building Drawings-Background), National Defense University Library, Washington, DC. The document was clipped from an unknown source which reviewed architecture. The language used in the text suggests it was written shortly after 1908.

²²⁵Ibid.

²²⁶Ibid.

dignity was added to the exterior by the approaches. Low granite steps lead to a wide platform which is paved in red brick laid in an ornamental style. The roof of the college is in the shape of a cross, with a low octagonal dome at the intersections.²²⁷

At the completion of the Army War College building, the German government presented the United States with a statue of Frederick the Great and was placed on a pedestal at the entrance of the building. The statue was temporarily removed from the pedestal during World War I and permanently removed in 1946. Since the opening of the National War College, there are three symbols which represent each of the three Services located on pedestals at the entrance of the building: a bronze cannon (Army), anchors (Navy), and heavy bombs (Air Force).²²⁸

Inside the structure is a bronze plaque that is inscribed as follows:

Because of the special interest and effort of ELIHU ROOT, Secretary of War, creator of the general staff of the Army, this building for the Army War College was authorized by acts of Congress approved June 30, 1902 and April 23, 1904. Architects, McKim, Mead, & White.

²²⁷Ibid.

²²⁸National War College, "Fort Lesley J. McNair: Home of the National War College and the Industrial College of the Armed Forces," NWC Visual Aid 13,580,'54,1000, 1954?, Special Collections, National Defense University Library, Washington, DC.

Constructing Engineer, John Stephen Sewell, Captain, Corps of Engineers, United States Army. Cornerstone laid February 21, 1903. Building occupied June 30, 1907.²²⁹

The plaque is flanked on the right by a portrait of Henry L. Stimson, former Secretary of War and Secretary of State and on the left by former President Theodore Roosevelt. In addition, on the edges of the circle formed by the rotunda, the busts of General John Pershing, former U.S. Army Chief of Staff; five-star General Dwight D. Eisenhower and former U.S. President; and General Walter Smith, former ambassador to the U.S.S.R., director of the CIA and undersecretary of State.²³⁰

This beautiful building was occupied by the Army War College in 1907, the Army General Headquarters in 1940, the Army and Navy Staff College in 1945, and the National War College since 1946.²³¹ It can be admired off Interstate 295 South by commuters and tourists on their route to and from the Nation's Capital.

On 24 June 1974, the building was designated as a

²²⁹National War College, plaque inside the National War College Building, Ft McNair, Washington, DC.

²³⁰visual observations made by the author.

²³¹U.S. National War College, "Official Ceremony Commemorating the National War College as a National Historic Landmark."

National Landmark by the U.S. Department of the Interior.²³² In celebration of the event, a President Theodore Roosevelt commemorative coin was minted with a bust of the former president on the obverse side and the dates of his presidential inaugurations on the reverse side. The building's name was changed to Theodore Roosevelt Hall.

Today, the parade grounds no longer exist in front of the National War College building. In fact, because the post is on a peninsula and there is limited space, two of nine greens for the post golf course lie in front of the National War College building.

A Note on Fort Lesley J. McNair

Fort Lesley J. McNair is named after Lieutenant General McNair, U.S. Army, who was killed in Normandy in 1944. However, it had several name changes over the years.²³³ Originally, referred to as the fort on Turkey Buzzard Point in 1693,²³⁴ the fort was renamed the United States Arsenal at Greenleaf's point and then the

²³²Ibid.

²³³National War College, "Fort Lesley J. McNair," 11; National Defense University, "A Chronological History."

²³⁴National Defense University, "A Chronological History."

Washington Arsenal.²³⁵ The post mission changed in 1881 and was renamed the Washington Barracks.²³⁶ After World War I, it was renamed The Army War College (post), Fort Humphreys, and then back to the Army War College (school). Finally, the fort was renamed Fort Lesley J. McNair in 1948.²³⁷

In addition to the history of the National War College building, the surrounding buildings have historical items of interest. The two-month trial of the Lincoln Conspirators was held in one of the oldest buildings of the fort in 1865.²³⁸ Mary Surratt, Lewis Paine, David Herold, and George Atzerodt were hanged in the yard of the penitentiary, the brick building near the center of the parade grounds and buried next to the scaffolding.²³⁹ On 9 July 1865 it housed a military

²³⁵National War College, "Fort Lesley J. McNair," 11.

²³⁶National Defense University, "A Chronological History."

²³⁷National War College, "Fort Lesley J. McNair," 11.

²³⁸The remaining section of the original building.

²³⁹National Defense University, Display Panel Titled: "Fort McNair 1965: The Post as it Was; the Lincoln Conspirators; the Executions," photos no. 7, 9, and 12, Special Collections, National Defense University Library, Washington, DC. The display panel has actual photographs of the Penitentiary Building, the conspirators, scaffolding, and the actual hanging by

prison and the body of John Wilkes Booth was buried under one of the cells until it was moved to a family plot in Baltimore, Maryland.²⁴⁰

Evolution of the National War College

Background

The National War College officially opened its doors to students on 3 September 1946, however, planning for the college dates back to approximately 1943.²⁴¹ This section provides the official history described by the War Department and a brief history of the college from its inception to the present.

Objective of Joint Military Education

To understand the genesis of the National War College, a historical synopsis is needed to explain the

Alexander Gardner. The bodies of the conspirators were buried at (then) the Washington Arsenal in 1865 near the current tennis courts and moved to private cemeteries in 1869. See National Defense University, "A Chronological History." See also D. Mark Katz, Witness to an Era: The Life and Photographs of Alexander Gardner (New York: Penguin Group, 1991), 165-201.

²⁴⁰Kilpatrick, "Tomorrow's Leaders," 58.

²⁴¹National Defense University, Archival Administrative Memoranda, Vol 1 and 2, 51. The document cited is a memorandum dated 5 March 1947, #QMGRD424.2, from the War Department Quartermaster General to the National War College Commandant, Subject: Coat of Arms for National War College and provides the official history of the National War College.

emergence of joint military education.

Before 7 December 1941, the wars of the United States were fought with little coordination between the Army and the Navy resulting in the fighting of two wars, one on land and one at sea.²⁴² General "Hap" Arnold, Chief of Staff of the Army Air Forces, again and again was impressed with the ignorance of his air officers on land and sea warfare. He was extremely concerned that his officers were ill-informed of the missions of the other Services.²⁴³

During World War II, joint warfare became instrument of the success of the United States and has been a major ingredient of American warfighting up to and including the recent example during the Persian Gulf War.²⁴⁴

For example, the use of joint campaigning in the Solomon Islands in 1942-1943 integrated naval, land, and air operations resulting in a critical turning point in the war against Japan.²⁴⁵ Additionally, General Dwight

²⁴²Norton, "The Place and Purpose of the National War College in the Military Education System of the United States," 20.

²⁴³Ibid., 22.

²⁴⁴U.S. Joint Chiefs of Staff, Joint Warfare of the US Armed Forces (Washington, DC: National Defense University Press, 1991).

²⁴⁵Ibid., 25-26.

D. Eisenhower's successful use of joint operations in World War II with Operation OVERLORD is a classic example of the synergy created by an effective battle fought by inter-Service forces.²⁴⁶ Examples in the Korean Conflict and the Persian Gulf War were equally impressive.²⁴⁷

The increased use of joint campaigns in the wars fought by the United States called for the need for joint education. Today, that education is provided through National Defense University through its colleges including the Armed Forces Staff College, an intermediate service school; the Industrial College of the Armed Forces, a senior Service war college; and the National War College.

Official History

On 5 March 1947 the War Department directed the history of the National War College be recorded as follows:

The National War College was originally established as the Army and Navy Staff College, per WD Memorandum No. W350-154-43, dated 4 June 1943, which formally opened 5 August 1943. Effective 1 July 1946, per WD GO #51, dated 10 June 1946, the Army and Navy Staff College was redesignated the National War College which

²⁴⁶Ibid., 49.

²⁴⁷Ibid., 16; Kitfield, "Schooled in Warfare," 22.

formally opened 3 September 1946. The National War College has no other history and is not entitled to battle honors.²⁴⁸

A Historical Perspective

During World War II, the need for inter-service cooperation expanded with the massive increase of the use of airpower over previous conflicts. This increased use of joint operations during war led to the immediate establishment of the Army and Navy Staff College on 1 June 1943 by the Joint Chiefs of Staff.²⁴⁹ The college was located at Georgetown University in Washington, DC to maintain close access with the senior military and civilian leadership as well as use Georgetown University's convenient facilities.²⁵⁰

²⁴⁸National Defense University, Archival Administrative Memoranda, Vol 1 and 2, 51. The document cited is a memorandum dated 5 March 1947 from the Quartermaster General, W. H. Middleswart to the Commandant of the National War College. In the citation, "WD" refers to the War Department and "GO" for general order. The Department of Defense was initially created as the War Department.

²⁴⁹Johnson, Development of the National War College and Peer Institutions, 28-29; Norton, "The Place and Purpose of the National War College in the Military Educational System of the United States," 22. It was, in part, General Arnold's concern noted above that led to the need for joint education. General Arnold suggested to his colleagues of the Joint Chiefs of Staff that immediate action was necessary.

²⁵⁰Johnson, Development of the National War College and Peer Institutions, 28; Norton, "The Place and Purpose of the National War College in the Military Educational

The purpose of the Army and Navy Staff College was to "train officers of all the arms in the exercise of command and the performance of staff duties in unified or coordinated Army and Navy commands."²⁵¹ The intention of the Joint Chiefs of Staff was the creation of a temporary institution during the war.²⁵²

Despite the temporary plan for education during the war, it was realized by all the Services before the end of World War II that joint military education, for all the reasons the Army and Navy Staff College was formed, should be necessary after the war to accommodate students from each Service and the State Department.²⁵³ On 14 July 1944, the commandant of the Army and Navy Staff

System of the United States," 23.

²⁵¹Norton, "The Place and Purpose of the National War College in the Military Education System of the United States," 22-23. A unified command is one that includes units from two or more services compared to a specified command that includes units from only one service.

²⁵²Johnson, Development of the National War College and Peer Institutions, 29.

²⁵³Masland and Radway, Soldiers and Scholars, 140-141; Norton, "The Place and Purpose of the National War College in the Military Educational System of the United States," 27; Hattendorf, Simpson, and Wadleigh, Sailors and Scholars, 180-181. The State Department pushed for their own institution to study national security within a National Security University, however, eventually the State Department agreed to send their students to the National War College.

College wrote to the Joint Chiefs of Staff, "In view of the purpose of its establishment, assigned training and educational mission, and the scope of its curriculum in order to accomplish that mission, it would seem clear that the present Army and Navy Staff College is destined for perpetuation in some form after this war. The experience of this war so dictates."²⁵⁴

After the war, the Joint Chiefs of Staff appointed Lieutenant General J. L. DeWitt, commandant of the Army and Navy Staff College, to prepare a "general plan for post-war education of the Armed Forces."²⁵⁵ On 29 September 1945, the Joint Chiefs of Staff approved the termination of the Army and Navy Staff College and development of instructional and administrative plans for a permanent post-war joint college to be completed by September 1946.²⁵⁶ A press release formally announced the creation of the new joint service college on 17

²⁵⁴Norton, "The Place and Purpose of the National War College in the Military Education System of the United States," 27.

²⁵⁵Hattendorf, Simpson, and Wadleigh, Sailors and Scholars, 180-181.

²⁵⁶National Defense University, Archival Administrative Memoranda, Vol 1 and 2, 3. The document cited is a memorandum dated 29 September 1945, #SM [secretary memorandum] 3592 from the Joint Chiefs of Staff to the Army and Navy Staff College Commandant, Subject: Post-War Army and Navy Staff College.

February 1946 that would include students from the Foreign Service and Department of State.²⁵⁷

Agreement on the name of the new institution was not easily settled. The Commanding General of the Army Air Forces pushed for "college of national security." The Chief of Naval Operations wanted the "Army and Navy Staff and Command College," if a change was even necessary.²⁵⁸ Pending exposure of this high-level disagreement in the Washington newspapers by Drew Pearson, a noted Washington columnist, the Joint Chiefs of Staff agreed to name the new institution the "College of National Security" in February 1946 . . . and rescinded their decision three days later.²⁵⁹ Finally, on 22 March 1946, the Joint Chiefs of Staff agreed to name the new institution the "National War College."²⁶⁰ General Eisenhower, Army

²⁵⁷Strobridge, "The Joint Chiefs of Staff and the Joint Education System," 6-7. The press release according to Strobridge was the Department of State Bulletin, p. 259.

²⁵⁸Ibid.

²⁵⁹Ibid., 7-8.

²⁶⁰National Defense University, Archival Administrative Memoranda, Vol 1 and 2, 24. The document cited is a memorandum dated 22 March 1946, #SM5344, from the Joint Chiefs of Staff to the Army and Navy Staff College Commandant, no subject. Discontent with the name of the institution continued. On 17 September 1957, the National War College commandant sought permission to change the name of the institution to the National Defense College (see National War College Annual Report

Chief of Staff, provided the vision, broad-mindedness, and energy to get the college underway. In addition, it was Eisenhower who offered the former Army War College building in Washington to house the new college.²⁶¹

Vice Admiral H. W. Hill, U.S. Navy, was the first commandant when the National War College opened its doors to students on 3 September 1946.²⁶² In his address to the first class, he highlighted the purposes of the college as a part of the national grand strategy in periods of war as well as peace. He further encouraged individual thought and expression by the students.²⁶³

On 5 March 1947, in military tradition, the War Department approved a coat of arms for the college. The

1956-1957 and Joint Chiefs of Staff memorandum dated 17 September 1957 to the National War College Commandant, Special Collections, National Defense University Library, Washington, DC). The State Department continued the name controversy and wanted the name changed to the National Defense University and do away with the name and connotation of the word "war." In 1961, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff met with President John F. Kennedy and secured the agreement of the President not to change the name of the institution (see Strobridge, "The Joint Chiefs of Staff and the Joint Education System," footnote #10, p. 8).

²⁶¹Masland and Radway, Soldiers and Scholars, 142.

²⁶²Ibid., 140-142.

²⁶³National Defense University, Archival Administrative Memoranda, Vol 1 and 2, 28-32. The document cited is a copy of the opening address by Admiral Hill dated 3 September 1946.

following description was approved in 1947 and has been used by the National War College since its inception:²⁶⁴

The colors represent the National colors, specifically, red for the Army and blue for the Navy. The twist, in Heraldry manner, is of the two dominating colors of the shield.

The crossed quills represent the State Department.

The swords are the traditional symbol of military power, and represent the three Armed Forces. The swords are placed under the quills to indicate that the Armed Forces of the nation support national policy.

Around the shield, the spray of oak represents the strength of the nation. The spray of laurel represents national achievement.

Surmounting the whole is the lamp of knowledge, indicating the educational institution.

Mission

The name of the National War College implies that the institution is charged with the promotion of war.²⁶⁵

²⁶⁴Ibid., 50-51. The documents cited are an unsigned note dated 5 March 1947 and a memorandum dated 5 March 1947, #QMGRD424.2, from the War Department Quartermaster General to the National War College Commandant, Subject: Coat of Arms for National War College. The memorandum includes the description of a coat of arms different from that described above. It is believed that the coat of arms was changed on 5 March 1947 and the unsigned note is a result of that change.

²⁶⁵Frederick H. Hartman, "The War Colleges in Perspective," The System for Educating Military Officers, ed. L. J. Korb (Pittsburgh, PA: International Studies Association, 1976), 129. Hartman stated that their [military war colleges] focus is in fact not war, but rather national defense or national security and warfare.

However, since the founding of the Army War College the emphasis of this and other military war colleges is more appropriately the promotion of a national strategy for world peace. In addition to laying the cornerstone of the Army War College, Secretary of War, Eihu Root's remarks also laid the cornerstone for defining the role of military war colleges. He said:

Not to promote war, but to preserve peace by intelligent and adequate preparation to repel aggression, this institution is founded.²⁶⁶

In addition, Admiral Hill, in his opening address in 1946 said, "the grand strategy [of the United States] is equally applicable in the maintenance of peace," on discussing the purpose of the National War College.²⁶⁷ Further, the Richmond News Leader, in March 1948, described the National War College "as a peace college and that the preservation of peace is the first duty of the nation, however, if peace is lost, it can be restored victoriously with the least wastage of life, time, and national resources."²⁶⁸

²⁶⁶Pappas, Prudens Futuri, 28.

²⁶⁷National Defense University, Archival Administrative Memoranda, Vol 1 and 2, 28-32. The document cited is a copy of the opening address by Admiral Hill dated 3 September 1946.

²⁶⁸"The National War College," Richmond News Leader, 16 March 1948, 12.

Maturation of the Mission

Since the inception of the National War College, the charter with the official mission approved by the Joint Chiefs of Staff has been modified four times.²⁶⁹ When the National War College opened in 1946, it did not have a formal mission statement chartered by the Joint Chiefs of Staff.²⁷⁰ However, it has had a mission statement since its opening. The 1946 Gerow Report stated that the mission of the National War College was "to provide instruction to insure the nationally efficient development, organization, and employment of armed forces and the utilization of the nation's resources to support these forces in the furtherance of national policy."²⁷¹

²⁶⁹Gerald P. Stadler, "National War College 1995," [1989], p. 1, Special Collections, National Defense University Library, Washington, DC. This document was written by the current National War College commandant in a "blueprint" for the National War College into the twenty-first century. General Stadler identified three modifications to the mission. Since its writing, the Joint Chiefs of Staff published the Military Education Policy Document in 1990 which included the fourth modification to the mission statement for the National War College.

²⁷⁰Strobridge, "The Joint Chiefs of Staff and the Joint Education System," 8; Norton, "The Place and Purpose of the National War College in the Military Education System of the United States," 34.

²⁷¹Masland and Radway, Soldiers and Scholars, 140-143. The Gerow Report was named after Lieutenant General Leonard T. Gerow, appointed by the President of the War Department Education Board. This report is the final report of that board chartered to propose an education

Further, the authors of the report anticipated that graduates would exercise a great influence on the formulation of national and foreign policy.²⁷²

In his opening address of the National War College, Admiral Hill stated the mission of the college. The same mission statement was listed in War Department Circular #378 and had two sections:

To prepare selected ground, air, and naval officers for the exercise of command and the performance of joint staff duties in the highest echelons of the armed forces.

And:

To promote the development of understanding between echelons of the armed forces and those other agencies of government which are an essential part of a national war effort.²⁷³

The First Charter

In a memorandum from the Chief of Naval Operations to the Joint Chiefs of Staff on 10 October 1947, concern was expressed that the National War College did not have

institution after World War II to take the place of the Army and Navy Staff College. See also Johnson, Development of the National War College and Peer Institutions, 45.

²⁷²Ibid.

²⁷³National Defense University, Archival Administrative Memoranda, Vol 1 and 2, 42. The document cited is a War Department Circular #378 dated 25 December 1946 and includes a mission statement for the National War College, Industrial College of the Armed Forces, Armed Forces Staff College, and the Command and Staff College.

an official charter with a mission statement from the Joint Chiefs of Staff.²⁷⁴ Less than one month later, on 6 March 1947, the Joint Chiefs of Staff approved the first official mission unmodified from the recommendations of the Chief of Naval Operations.²⁷⁵ Like the War Department mission statement, the first mission statement issued by the Joint Chiefs of Staff was divided into two subsections:

To prepare selected personnel of the armed forces and the State Department for the exercise of joint high level policy, command and staff functions, and for the performance of strategic planning duties in their respective departments.

And:

To promote the development of understanding of those agencies of government and those factors of power potential which are an essential part of a national war effort.²⁷⁶

²⁷⁴U.S. Chief of Naval Operations, Memorandum to the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Serial: 188P30, 10 October 1947, [Subject]: Directive for the National War College, Special Collections, National Defense University Library, Washington, DC. This document also carries a JCS document number 962/38 dated 13 October 1947 (assumed to be the date received by the Joint Chiefs of Staff). The Chief of Naval Operations is the highest military position in the U.S. Navy similar to the Army Chief of Staff or Air Force Chief of Staff and is a member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

²⁷⁵U.S. Joint Chiefs of Staff, Memorandum to the National War College Commandant, SM-9166, 6 November 1947, Subject: Directive for the National War College, Special Collections, National Defense University Library, Washington, DC.

²⁷⁶Ibid.

In addition to the mission statement, the scope of the National War College was also included in the Joint Chiefs of Staff's charter identifying the subject areas that were to be studied.²⁷⁷

The Mission Revised

A board was established in 1955 by the Joint Chiefs of Staff to survey the missions and relationships of the National War College and the Industrial College of the Armed Forces and to make recommendations for improvement.²⁷⁸ This board was chaired by Dr. James P. Baxter III and is frequently called the "Baxter Report." The Baxter Report concluded that the existing statement of the mission for the National War College did not emphasize the combined operation and command aspects and to direct attention to the psychological, political, economic and scientific factors of national security in

²⁷⁷Ibid.

²⁷⁸U.S. Joint Chiefs of Staff, "Report to the Joint Chiefs of Staff of the National War College and the Industrial College of the Armed Forces Survey Board," 20 January 1955, Special Collections, National Defense University Library, Washington, DC, 1. This report was charged to identify whether the National War College and the Industrial College of the Armed Forces should be combined. That portion of the report is not included here, however, the board concluded that it was not in the best interests to combine the two colleges. The shortened reference for this report will be the "Baxter Report."

peace as well as war.²⁷⁹

As a result of the Baxter Report, the Joint Chiefs of Staff revised the initial charter of the National War College on 22 June 1955. That revision included the recommendations of the Baxter Report and simplified the mission into a single statement. Further, the scope of the college was stream-lined. The new mission statement read:

To conduct a course of study of those agencies of government and those military, economic, scientific, political, psychological and social factors of power potential, which are essential parts of national security in order to enhance the preparation of selected personnel of the armed forces and State Department for the exercise of joint and combined high level policy, command, and staff functions and for the planning of national strategy.²⁸⁰

This mission would remain unchanged for more than twenty years.

The Second Revision

The next revision to the initial Joint Chiefs of Staff charter for the National War College was in 1976

²⁷⁹Ibid., 2. The report concluded that the mission statement for the Industrial College of the Armed Forces was also inadequate.

²⁸⁰U.S. Joint Chiefs of Staff, Memorandum to the National War College Commandant, SM488-55, 22 June 1955, Subject: Report of the National War College and the Industrial College of the Armed Forces Survey Board, Special Collections, National Defense University Library, Washington, DC.

with the founding of the National Defense University.²⁸¹ When the National Defense University was established, it became the organization which consisted of all the joint education colleges: the National War College, Industrial College of the Armed Forces, and later the Armed Forces Staff College.²⁸² The new mission was approved by the Department of Defense and was changed to read:

To conduct senior level courses of study and associated research in national security policy with emphasis on its formulation and future directions in order to enhance the preparation of selected personnel of the Armed Forces, the Department of State, and other U.S. Government departments and agencies for the exercise of joint and combined high level policy, command, and staff functions in the planning and implementation of national security.²⁸³

The mission statement once again focused on its original premises: joint education for military and selected senior-level civilians in national security.

Changes in the Recent Past

In 1982, the mission of the National War College was

²⁸¹National Defense University, National Defense University 1991-1992 Catalogue, 12.

²⁸²Ibid. The Armed Forces Staff College located in Norfolk, Virginia joined the National Defense University in 1981.

²⁸³U.S. Department of Defense, Joint Secretariat, Note to the Joint Chiefs of Staff, JCS 2484/6-13, dated 8 April 1976, [Subject]: Charter of the National War College, Special Collections, National Defense University Library, Washington, DC.

revised by the president of the National Defense University.²⁸⁴ Evident by the revision in 1982, the mission of the National War College became more similar to other colleges and universities.²⁸⁵ The mission was redefined to:

Conduct a course of study promoting excellence in the development of national security policy and strategy, and the application of military power in support thereof, including doctrine for joint and combined operations and consideration of warfighting capabilities.

Further:

Through study and research, enhance the preparation of selected personnel of the Armed Forces, the Department of State, and other U.S. government departments and agencies to perform high level command and staff and policy functions associated with national security strategy formulation and implementation.

The most recent and final change to the mission of

²⁸⁴National Defense University, memorandum to the Dean of Students and Administration, 8 March 1982, Subject: NDU Charter/Mission Statement, Special Collections, National Defense University Library, Washington, DC. This change to the mission statement is different from the others inasmuch as the mission was changed by the president of the college who advised the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

²⁸⁵The mission statement evolved over time becoming more difficult to measure similar to what Michael Cohen and James March illustrate in their work, "Leadership in an Organized Anarchy," in Marvin W. Peterson, ed., ASHE Reader on Organization and Governance in Higher Education, 3d Ed. (Needham Heights, MA: Ginn Press, 1988), 238-239. The ambiguity of purpose is an ambiguity that college administrators face in determining the success of the institution.

the National War College was made by the Joint Chiefs of Staff in 1990 with the publication of the Military Education Policy Document.²⁸⁶ That mission statement is a concise integration of the mission statements from 1976 and 1982. It states:

The NWC [National War College] mission is to prepare future leaders of the Armed Forces, State Department, and other civilian agencies for high-level policy, command, and staff responsibilities by conducting a senior-level course of study in national security strategy.²⁸⁷

When discussing the mission of the National War College, we must note that the intent for the college was to stand at the apex of military education designed for a small number of carefully selected officers.²⁸⁸ However, Johnson concluded that the college never gained that official designation. Instead, the National War College officially shares the apex of military higher education with those of the Sister services and the Industrial College of the Armed Forces.²⁸⁹ As an institution, the National Defense University, including the National War College, is the premier military

²⁸⁶U.S. Joint Chiefs of Staff, Military Education Policy Document.

²⁸⁷Ibid., p. IV-B-1.

²⁸⁸Masland and Radway, Soldiers and Scholars, 141.

²⁸⁹Johnson, Development of the National War College and Peer Institutions, 151-152.

institution in the Western world.²⁹⁰ Further, the Joint Chiefs of Staff's Military Education Policy Document implies that the institutions within the National Defense University, as joint schools, stand at the apex of senior military education for joint training; while the Service senior colleges stand at the apex for their individual Services with a focus on military strategy and joint emphasis.²⁹¹

Fulfillment of the Mission

Peripherally, the course of study has changed from supporting a national war effort, just after World War II, to a course of study in national security strategy in modern times. However, the core of the National War College has been to prepare senior officers of the military and senior leaders of the Department of State and other government agencies for the most senior posts in the United States. It is important, therefore to determine how well the National War College has met its goals. In other words, how well does the National War College do what it says it does?

Winston Churchill pointed out, in 1946, that it was

²⁹⁰van Creveld, The Training of Officers, 54.

²⁹¹U.S. Joint Chiefs of Staff, Military Education Policy Document, p. II-1 to II-11.

the senior Service schools that prepared the Eisenhowers, Bradleys, Clarks, and Gruenthers for their massively responsible roles in World War II.²⁹² That position is amplified with the founding of the National War College itself, a result of the success of the Army and Navy Staff College which was formed during World War II.²⁹³ More recently, the success of the Persian Gulf War is credited to a successful military education system.²⁹⁴ Two instrumental figures in that war, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, General Colin Powell, Class of 1976, and United States Ambassador to Kuwait Nathaniel Howell, Class of 1983, were students of the National War College²⁹⁵ and many others were graduates of Service war colleges. Military war colleges will continue that trend by studying the successes and failures of that most recent war.²⁹⁶

²⁹²Franklin M. Davis, Jr., "The Dilemma of the Senior Service Colleges: A Commentary," in The System for Educating Military Officers, ed. L. J. Korb (Pittsburgh, PA: International Studies Association, 1976), 108.

²⁹³Norton, "The Place and Purpose of the National War College in the Military Education System of the United States," 29-30.

²⁹⁴Kitfield, "Schooled in Warfare," 22-24.

²⁹⁵NWC Alumni Association, Directory of National War College Graduates, 1988, Washington, DC: Author.

²⁹⁶Kitfield, "Schooled in Warfare," 22-23.

Organization and Administration

Governance

Between 1949 and 1976, the National War College had two bodies with governance roles: the Joint Chiefs of Staff and a Board of Consultants. The Joint Chiefs of Staff clearly has the more active role of governance for the institution. For example, the Joint Chiefs of Staff chartered the institution, provided the mission and scope, "appointed" the president (commandant) of the institution, and set broad policy regarding the curriculum. Before 1949, the Joint Chiefs of Staffs was the single governing body.

The Board of Consultants is an advisory body which was authorized by the Joint Chiefs of Staff in JCS Memorandum 3-49 on 3 January 1949.²⁹⁷ Before the Board of Consultants was established, a Board of Civilian Advisors assisted with the first curriculum and the establishment of the National War College.²⁹⁸

The Board of Consultants included presidents and chancellors of public and private colleges and

²⁹⁷American Council on Education, The National War College 1973-1974 Institutional Report, n.d. (Washington, DC: American Council on Education, 77.

²⁹⁸National Defense University, Archival Administrative Memoranda, Vol 1 and 2, 31. The document cited is a copy of the opening address by Admiral Hill.

universities, captains of industry, and executive-level government officials.²⁹⁹ Initially seven, and as many as nine members were appointed to the board by the commandant and approved by the Joint Chiefs of Staff for three-year terms of office. In addition, two exofficio members remained on the board.³⁰⁰

The board met annually and was charged to review and make recommendations for the future of the curriculum, procedures, and techniques of the National War College. The recommendations of the board were provided to the commandant of the college for action as he or she considered in the best interest of the institution.³⁰¹ The Board of Consultants for the National War College was dissolved when the college was reorganized under the National Defense University.

²⁹⁹The Board of Consultants in 1955 included Dr. Raymond B. Allen, chancellor, University of California; Former General of the Army Omar N. Bradley, Chairman of the Board, Bulova Research and Development Labs; Dr. Bernard Brodie of the RAND Corporation; The Honorable Robert Murphy, deputy undersecretary of State; Dr. C. Easton Rothwell of Stanford University; Dr. Henry M. Wriston, president, Brown University; and Dr. Frederick L. Hovde, president, Purdue University. National War College, Report of the Board of Consultants of the National War College, 1955, 22 April 1955, Special Collections, National Defense University Library, Washington, DC.

³⁰⁰American Council on Education, The National War College 1973-1974 Institutional Report, 77.

³⁰¹Ibid.

Organizational Structure

The organizational structure of the National War College is similar to most colleges within a larger university. Today, the National War College relies on the National Defense University for the majority of its support and administrative staff. The chief executive officer is the commandant, a major general or Naval rear admiral (two-star military officer).³⁰² He or she has an international affairs advisor, dean of students and executive officer, and dean of faculty and academic programs with two associate deans. The director of administration reports to the dean of students and the departments of military strategy and operations and national security policy report to the dean of faculty and academic programs.³⁰³

The first commandant had a small staff. Included among the deputy commandants was a deputy for foreign affairs; chiefs of an international affairs division, intelligence division, logistics division, operations division; and four military faculty committees. Military officers chaired each of the divisions except the

³⁰²The president of the National Defense University is a three-star military officer who serves a three year term and is rotated among the Services.

³⁰³National Defense University, National Defense University 1991-1992 Catalogue, 42.

International Affairs Division which fell under the responsibility of a senior-level civilian. The division chiefs reported to the executive officer as did the library, visual aids, and administration.³⁰⁴

The organizational structure for the National War College was reviewed in 1951 and two deputy commandants were identified: academic and administration. In addition, the executive officer's responsibilities were redefined to include oversight of the personnel and administration officer, security officer, operations officer, supply officer, and the director of the library.³⁰⁵

The organizational structure was expanded in April 1953. A civilian professor was added as director of instruction under the deputy commandant for academics. The subordinate offices to the deputy commandant for administration were expanded to include the adjutant and

³⁰⁴National Defense University, Archival Administrative Memoranda, Vol 1 and 2, 34; National War College, "Report of a Committee Convened to Review the Organization of the National War College," June 1967, Special Collections, National Defense University Library, Washington, DC. The document cited from the administrative memoranda is a reproduction of the initial organizational chart. The committee report illustrates each organizational chart from 1946 to 1964.

³⁰⁵National War College, "Report of a Committee Convened to Review the Organization of the National War College."

personnel office, security and supervision for the cafeteria, operations, supply and book department, library, and a quarterly. A total of twenty-six officers and ninety-five civilians, of which three were foreign service officers were assigned to the college.³⁰⁶

Three years later, the organization went through a major modification. An academic board was added to advise the commandant. The deputy commandant for academic affairs included the political affairs division, military affairs division, national strategic division, and the educational development division. The deputy commandant for military affairs had no major divisions and dealt directly with students as did the deputy for foreign affairs. The executive officer oversaw the adjutant, security, operations, supply and maintenance, administrative services, and the library. A total of 116 military and civilians made up the staff.³⁰⁷

In 1964, the organization chart was simplified to a staff of 108. The deputy commandant for academic affairs' responsibility was unchanged. The deputy commandant for military affairs was eliminated; and the subordinate support offices were simply adjutant,

³⁰⁶Ibid.

³⁰⁷Ibid.

security, comptroller, library, and operations. The academic board was chaired by the deputy commandant for academic affairs, and included the deputy commandant for foreign affairs, the executive officer, directors of academic departments, the librarian, and a secretary who was a designated military member of the faculty.³⁰⁸

The National War College Curriculum

The curriculum at the National War College is not unlike those among other graduate-level colleges and universities inasmuch as it has continually been reviewed and modified as influenced by internal and external constituencies. The section includes the major points of interest of the initial curriculum and three of the most significant influences on the curriculum changing it into what it is today. In addition, the evolution of the credentials that are conferred on the students to show that he or she has successfully completed the prescribed course of study is discussed.

The First Curriculum

Admiral Hill sought advice from and brought together a cadre of consultants from leading colleges and universities to build the first curriculum for the

³⁰⁸Ibid.

National War College³⁰⁹ These consultants included representation from Duke, Dartmouth, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Columbia, Yale, Harvard, the University of Pennsylvania, the University of Chicago, Williams College, and Princeton.³¹⁰

The basic philosophy of the National War College has always been to increase the students' capacity to think broadly, conceptually, analytically, and critically as they involve themselves in the grand strategy and United States national security policy--its formulation and implementation.³¹¹

To accomplish those goals, the first curriculum prepared for the National War College contained eleven units. The titles of the courses were: indoctrination, scientific research and development, war as an instrument of national policy, factors affecting military potentials

³⁰⁹National Defense University, Archival Administrative Memoranda, Vol 1 and 2, 101. The document cited is a memorandum dated 17 March 1950 from the National War College executive officer, Colonel Richard J. Werne to Major General Weyland, Subject: National War College Board of Consultants.

³¹⁰National Defense University, Verticle File: National War College Curriculum-1946-47, 1946?, Special Collections, National Defense University Library, Washington, DC. The documents cited are the comments provided to the National War College on the first curriculum.

³¹¹Keagle, "A Summary of Major Activities and Their Evolution" 2.

as nations, international commitments of the U.S. and military potential for supporting these commitments, military potential of other countries, mobilization of the military potential, joint operations, strategic considerations, analytical studies of joint operations, and development of war plans.³¹² The method of study is discussed in the following section "Students and Faculty."

The duration of the course initially was 10 months, from September to June, and has not changed since the college's inception.³¹³

Revolutionizing the Curriculum

Since the first curriculum used in 1946-1947, there have been many influences on the curriculum. While many of the influences have been external, the college also reviewed the curriculum annually and made modifications each year. The major influences noted here are those external to the institution.

³¹²National Defense University, Archival Administrative Memoranda, Vol 1 and 2, 15. The document cited is a memorandum from Admiral Hill to the Army Chief of Staff dated 22 January 1946 with a copy of the outline for the curriculum for the proposed post-war Army and Navy Staff College later called the National War College. Within each unit, the general subjects to be examined were included.

³¹³Ibid.

In addition to the reforms in the mission of the National War College, the Baxter Report also proposed that joint education be given greater priority in the curriculum.³¹⁴ This recommendation helped to shape the focus of the curriculum so that joint education remained the primary priority.

Over time, the American Council on Education has been invited to conduct periodic evaluations of the National War College as an institution with regard to allowing educational credit for its courses. The 1971 evaluation by the Commission on Accreditation of Service Experience forced the National War College to organize and improve the curriculum.³¹⁵ In their 1973-1974 report, the American Council on Education identified several areas that were improved as a result of a three-year curriculum and institutional study. The result was an expansion of course offerings that provided students with an appreciation for contemporary events and a greater range of theoretical and methodological concepts.³¹⁶ In addition, the elective study program

³¹⁴U.S. Joint Chiefs of Staff, "Report to the Joint Chiefs of Staff of the National War College and the Industrial College of the Armed Forces Survey Board," 3.

³¹⁵American Council on Education, The National War College 1973-1974 Institutional Report, 3.

³¹⁶Ibid.

was expanded and extra-curricular activities were better integrated into the student's total experience at the college.³¹⁷

The most wide-sweeping influence on the National War College³¹⁸ curriculum was the Goldwater-Nichols Department of Defense Reorganization Act of 1986.³¹⁹ The purpose of the act was to strengthen the joint elements of the senior leaders of the military and enhance joint-service education to meet the increased responsibilities of the joint elements and provide officers with a joint perspective.³²⁰ That Act further emphasized the importance of grooming military officers for joint-service positions and that improvements in joint-service education was necessary for the military's senior officer corps. Joint-service education for certain joint-service positions was prescribed by law for the first time.³²¹

³¹⁷Ibid., 3, 91-93.

³¹⁸As well as other professional military education at all levels.

³¹⁹Strobridge, "The Joint Chiefs of Staff and the Joint Education System," 55.

³²⁰Congress, House, Committee on Armed Services, Panel on Military Education, Report of the Panel on Military Education, 11-12.

³²¹Strobridge, "The Joint Chiefs of Staff and the Joint Education System," 57.

Subsequent, and in response to the Goldwater-Nichols Act, the Panel on Military Education was formed by the Chairman of the House Armed Services Committee.³²² The panel was charged to "assess the ability of the current Department of Defense military education system to develop professional military strategists, joint war fighters and tacticians" and to "review joint professional military education requirements of the Goldwater-Nichols Act with a view toward assuring that this education provides the proper linkage between the service competent officers and the competent joint officers."³²³

The effects of the above external influences and the annual curriculum reviews by the administration and faculty of the National War College have resulted in a curriculum that expands and deepens the student's knowledge of national security and sharpens analytical skills. Today's curriculum includes core courses, advanced studies, and regional studies.³²⁴ A variety of methods are used to teach the curriculum and includes

³²²Congress, House, Committee on Armed Services, Panel on Military Education, Report of the Panel on Military Education, 11.

³²³Ibid., 12-13.

³²⁴National Defense University, National Defense University 1991-1992 Catalogue, 45.

lectures, seminars, case studies, and student exercises. Completion of the course qualifies military officers as Joint Specialty Officers and meets the spirit and intent of the Goldwater-Nichols Act.³²⁵

Four courses are required in the core program and includes: Foundations of National Security Strategy, The National Security Policy Process, The Geostrategic Context, and Military Strategy and Operations.³²⁶ The three student exercises are similar to practicums where students apply their new knowledge. The Advanced Studies Program give the students latitude in enriching their core program with elective courses offered by either the Industrial College of the Armed Forces or National Defense University.³²⁷

Fulfillment of the Requirements

Students that complete the curriculum at the National War College earn a diploma. The proper recognition for the completion of the program, however,

³²⁵Ibid.

³²⁶Ibid., 47-48. Within the Foundations of National Security Strategy several blocks provide a foundation upon which the subsequent courses build. Subjects include American national security strategy, non-military instruments of statecraft, military thought and national security strategy, and the American experience in national security strategy.

³²⁷Ibid., 48.

has evolved as war colleges in general have evolved over time. Today, the National War College seeks to award an accredited Master of Science in National Security Strategy.³²⁸ The following synopsis provides the history of the evolution of the recognition for completion of the program of study and helps to recognize the evolution of these types of institutions and their increasingly similarity to other graduate universities in the United States.

War colleges have not always even granted a diploma or a certificate for the completion of the program. An Army general order on 27 June 1904 prohibited the award of diplomas at the end of the Army War College course. That order went on to say that the course was essentially one of applied knowledge on the part of capable and qualified officers and the mere selection for the course was sufficient recognition for his professional attainments.³²⁹ A problem with that philosophy was that designation to attend did not necessarily mean that the student completed the course. For example, one of the most noted alum of the college is General (then captain)

³²⁸Jaschik, "A College for the Next Generation of Military Leaders," A3.

³²⁹Pappas, Prudens Futuri, 46. The specific quote used the word his versus his or her because only men attended the college at that time.

John J. Pershing. He was a member of the first class at the Army War College, but never completed the course because of a reassignment to Japan.³³⁰

It was not until 1907 when the president of the Army War College, General Wotherspoon proposed that diplomas be awarded to officers who successfully completed the course. The Class of 1911 was the first class to receive the diplomas. In addition, General Wotherspoon granted diplomas at that time to all members of previous classes who had completed the course.³³¹

Some students at the Army War College and the National War College earned graduate degrees while attending their respective war college. The degree was a Master of Science Degree in International Affairs through an off-campus center of George Washington University.³³² Fifteen graduate hours completed at George Washington University were combined with the completion of the National War College curriculum for which an additional fifteen hours was granted. Additionally, the student was

³³⁰Ibid.

³³¹Ibid., 71-72. A picture of the first diplomas can be found in Prudens Futuri on page 72.

³³²National War College, "The George Washington University Program in International Affairs, 1966-1967," 11 July 1966, Special Collections, National Defense University Library, Washington, DC, 1.

required to write a master's thesis. For students with a master's degree, the credits could be applied toward a doctoral degree.³³³ That program at the National War College lasted from 1962 to 1977 and 724 students completed the program.³³⁴

Others have believed over time that more than a diploma should be granted for the successful completion of the war college. Considering the amount of time and effort spent in the year of work at the National War College, a degree at the Master's level should be granted.³³⁵ In 1954, Lieutenant General Craig, commandant of the National War College, sought to have the college accredited by the Middle States Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools.³³⁶ The general

³³³George Washington University and National War College, "Bilateral Supplement to the Basic Agreement Between the George Washington University and the National War College, 3 July 1964, Special Collections, National Defense University Library, Washington, DC.

³³⁴National Defense University, Verticle File: George Washington University, 1977?, Special Collections, National Defense University Library, Washington, DC. The number of graduates was extracted from the information in this verticle file.

³³⁵Norton, "The Place and Purpose of the National War College in the Military Education System of the United States," 51.

³³⁶H[oward] A. Craig, in a letter to the Joint Chiefs of Staff, 20 July 1954, Subject: Authorization for Granting a Master's Degree by the National War College, Special Collections, National Defense University Library,

identified four primary reasons to award the degree. First, the program justified the granting of a Master's Degree, the degree would benefit the officer in the discharge of his military duties, the degree would affect an economy for both the recipient and the government, and the degree would assist the retiring officer make a more satisfactory adjustment to civilian life.³³⁷

In November 1954, the general presented his self-study to the team of evaluators.³³⁸ In 1955, with the announcement of the evaluation team members, the Middle States Association of Colleges and Schools identified the following five benefits of being accredited. They were:

1. It would have considerable prestige value.
2. It would facilitate exchange of all kinds between the National War Colleges and civilian universities engaged in conducting similar graduate programs.

Washington, DC.

³³⁷Ibid.

³³⁸National War College, "Data Presented for Consideration of the Commission of Institutions of Higher Education, 15 November 1954, Special Collections, National Defense University Library, Washington, DC; Middle States Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools, "Information Concerning the Visit of the Evaluation Committee of the Middle States Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools, [1955], Special Collections, National Defense University Library, Washington, DC. The evaluation committee included Dr. Ewald B. Nyquist, Dr. Frank Bowles, Mr. John Berthel, Dr. Stephen K. Bailey, and Dr. John W. Masland.

3. It would be conducive to other practical results, such as giving added weight in terms of transferable graduate credit for work accomplished at the National War College.

4. Accreditation is the first requisite step toward obtaining authorization to grant a graduate degree, or degrees, by the National War College.

5. Finally, the MSA report will be of great value in itself . . . in terms of self-improvement wherever deficiencies are indicated.³³⁹

The Middle States Association report was very positive.³⁴⁰ However, before the association made a final decision, the National War College Board of Consultants was to meet in late April 1955. In a letter to the board, General Craig, commandant of the college, provided his arguments for awarding a Master's degree for completion of the curriculum. He wrote, "for some time some of us have felt that it would be advantageous to the position and prestige of the College--and even more particularly, to the morale of our graduates--if we were authorized to grant a Master's degree for a year's work at the college. At the same time, we clearly recognized

³³⁹Middle States Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools, "Information Concerning the Visit of the Evaluation Committee," 3.

³⁴⁰Middle States Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools, "Evaluation Report of the National War College," 16 March 1955, Special Collections, National Defense University Library, Washington, DC.

that such a degree without suitable accreditation would be worse than useless."³⁴¹

The Board of Consultants reviewed the commandant's comments and the Middle States Association's evaluation report and concluded:

It is our opinion, however, that the mission of The National War College is so distinctive that its organization, methods, and results must be different from those of universities or other institutions of higher education preparing persons for advanced degrees. We are convinced that graduation from The National War College, with award of the diploma, is on the whole a much better evidence of achievement than the granting of a Master of Arts degree would be. The suggested degree is essentially a junior degree and inappropriate for the achievement of persons of the maturity of the students assigned to The National War College.³⁴²

The board continued on the issue of accreditation to say:

We are convinced that the accreditation procedure incident to the degree would result in not only overt pressures but in more subtle influences designed to make The National War College conform to some academic procedures not appropriate to the mission of the College.³⁴³

In his final report to the college, General Craig announced that he had canceled his application for

³⁴¹H[oward] A. Craig, Report by the Commandant, the National War College, to the Board of Consultants, 21 April 1955, Special Collections, National Defense University Library, Washington, DC, 10.

³⁴²National War College, Report of the Board of Consultants of the National War College: 1955.

³⁴³Ibid.

accreditation based on the aforementioned recommendation from the Board of Consultants.³⁴⁴

An Update to the Literature

If Frederick Hartman wrote a 1992 postscript to his commentary in 1976,³⁴⁵ he would have to change his comments from "none of the war colleges is an accredited, degree-granting institution," to "one of the war colleges is an accredited degree-granting institution." The Naval War College was accredited in 1991 by the New England Association of Schools and Colleges to award a Master of Arts Degree in National Security and Strategic Studies.³⁴⁶

Martin van Creveld, in The Training of Officers: From Military Professionalism to Irrelevance, proposed the need for awarding a degree for professional military education at the war college level.³⁴⁷ He recommended that the best and the brightest students should be invited to stay for a second year to study the nonmilitary aspects of war, one field with which they are

³⁴⁴National War College, The Commandant's Annual Report: 1954-1955, 4.

³⁴⁵Hartman, "The War Colleges in Perspective," 129.

³⁴⁶Naval War College, United States Naval War College Catalog, 7.

³⁴⁷van Creveld, The Training of Officers, 108-109.

completely unfamiliar, and complete comprehensive examinations, a thesis or quite probably both. Those that stay a second year should be then granted a Ph.D. in national defense or strategic studies.³⁴⁸ The dilemma of what best represents the completion of the war college curriculum continues.

Students and Faculty

Growth of the Student Body

The student body is a highly selective group of military officers and executive level civilians. Military officers make up a greater proportion of the student body although the number of civilians has increased from approximately 10% to about 25% of the students attending the college.³⁴⁹

As mentioned previously, military officers must be in the grade of lieutenant colonel or colonel (and commander or captain in the U.S. Navy) to be eligible to attend the National War College.³⁵⁰ In addition to the

³⁴⁸Ibid.

³⁴⁹Keagle, "A Summary of Major Activities and Their Evolution," 17.

³⁵⁰Ibid., 17. Initially, students were colonels (or Navy captains) and general officers. As many as eight members in the Class of 1947 were general officers. However, beginning with the Class of 1963, 18 lieutenant colonels (or Navy commanders) were admitted and within a couple of years, over one-half were lieutenant colonels

rank criteria, students are selected based on their future promotion potential.³⁵¹ Further, the following four areas of an officer's career are considered in the selection of a military officer to attend the college. The best candidates have recently completed a command-level assignment, have previous joint experience,³⁵² be a graduate from an intermediate Service college,³⁵³ and have earned a graduate degree.³⁵⁴ Likewise, civilians should have obtained a professional level in their parent organization or agency comparable to their military

or Navy commanders. In a review of the graduates, by the author, of the Class of 1989, 60% were lieutenant colonels or Navy commanders, 23% were senior civilians, and 17% were colonels or Navy captains.

³⁵¹U.S. Joint Chiefs of Staff, Military Education Policy Document, p. IV-B-3.

³⁵²Joint experience are positions identified by the Joint Chiefs of Staff that have officers from two or more services and in which the personnel are rotated among the services.

³⁵³Keagle, "A Summary of Major Activities and Their Evolution," 17, and Johnson, Development of the National War College and Peer Institutions noted that the National War College was formed to be at the apex of professional military education and that students should be graduates of senior Service colleges in addition to intermediate Service colleges such as the Air War College, Army War College, and Naval War College. Advocates suggest that at least 40% be such graduates, however, rarely has the percentage been 20%.

³⁵⁴Ibid., 18. Initially few students who attended the college had graduate degrees, however between the mid-1960s and mid-1970s, the number of students with graduate degrees increased to over one-half.

counterparts, possess a graduate degree, and be on the progression for executive-level service.³⁵⁵

Between 1946 and 1990, 6,372 men and women graduated from the college.³⁵⁶ In 1990, 170 students graduated from the National War College,³⁵⁷ a 70% increase over the enrollment of the first class.³⁵⁸

In the 29 September 1947 memorandum from the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the enrollment for the National War College was established as approximately one-hundred students. Further, thirty students would come from each of the three services (Navy, Army, and Air Force) and ten from the State Department³⁵⁹ and in fact, one-hundred

³⁵⁵U.S. Joint Chiefs of Staff, Military Education Policy Document, p. IV-B-3.

³⁵⁶National Defense University, Verticle File: NWC Graduates, n.d., Special Collections, National Defense University Library, Washington, DC; NWC Alumni Association, Directory of National War College Graduates, 41-42; National Defense University, "Graduation Exercises: Classes of 1989," 1989, Special Collections, National Defense University Library, Washington, DC.; National Defense University, "Graduation Exercises: Classes of 1990," 1990, Special Collections, National Defense University Library, Washington, DC.

³⁵⁷National Defense University, Graduation Exercises: Classes of 1990.

³⁵⁸National Defense University, Archival Administrative Memoranda, Vol 1 and 2. The document cited is the memorandum dated 29 September 1945 from the Joint Chiefs of Staff to the Army and Navy Staff College Commandant (see footnote #30).

³⁵⁹Ibid.

graduated from the college in the Class of 1946-1947.³⁶⁰ The Joint Chiefs of Staff actively decided the size of each class.³⁶¹ For example, in 1956, the Joint Chiefs of Staff secretary sent a memorandum to the National War College commandant raising the student quota for the Navy from twenty-six to twenty-seven and the corresponding enrollment from 132 to 133. Further, it was mentioned that the increase (of one) was to be considered a special case and would not be a precedent for future classes.³⁶² Today, the Joint Chiefs of Staff are provided a list of those selected to attend the National War College although the Services and the college select the students

³⁶⁰National Defense University, Verticle File: NWC Graduates.

³⁶¹The Joint Chiefs of Staff's role initially was to review the number of students annually (U.S. Joint Chiefs of Staff memorandum to the National War College Commandant, #SM9166, 6 November 1947, Subject: Directive for the National War College. The first charter noted that the Joint Chiefs of Staff would determine the total enrollment and allocation of vacancies to the services and other governmental agencies annually in paragraph 7 of the aforementioned document.

³⁶²U.S. Joint Chiefs of Staff, memorandum to the National War College Commandant, #SM-602-56, 18 July 1956, Subject: Size and Composition of the 1956-1957 National War College Class, Special Collections, National Defense University Library, Washington, DC. A note of reference, the Joint Chiefs of Staff secretary, Air Force Colonel R. D. Wentworth was similar to an executive officer for the Joint Chiefs and would sign correspondence on behalf of this group.

based on the predetermined criteria noted above.³⁶³

Despite the initial determination of the Joint Chiefs of Staff to maintain the size of the student body near one-hundred, it has increased notably over time. Between 1946 and 1949, the class size averaged 107.5 and rose 16.7% to an average of 125.5 in the 1950s. The size of the student body continued to climb another 8.8% in the 1960s; and by the 1970s, the average class size of the National War College was 147. Most recently, the average class size increased 14.4% between the 1980s and the 1990s and ranges between 168 to 170.³⁶⁴

Although the size of the class has increased, the demographic characteristics of the student body have remained fairly constant. For example, the average age has remained at 42 years of age and students have between twenty-one and twenty-two years of service.³⁶⁵

The civilian students are predominately from the State Department, although the number of executives from

³⁶³U.S. Joint Chiefs of Staff, Military Education Policy Document, p. IV-B-3. It should be noted that the Joint Chiefs of Staff never selected the students to attend the college, but identified the numbers of students that could be selected.

³⁶⁴National Defense University, Verticle File: NWC Graduates. The statistics for this paragraph were computed by the author from this document.

³⁶⁵Keagle, "A Summary of Major Activities and Their Evolution," 17.

other agencies has increased over the years. For example, in 1989, the civilians were assigned from the Central Intelligence Agency, National Security Agency, Department of Defense secretariats, U.S. Information Agency, Congressional Research Service, U.S. Secret Service, and the Defense Communications Agency.³⁶⁶

The Faculty

The vision of the first commandant, Vice Admiral H. W. Hill had the makings of a collegial atmosphere. In his opening address, he said of the faculty and students:

The college is a collection of men engaged in common pursuits . . . It is not the intention that a group of men here with more knowledge will teach a group of men with less knowledge. Instead, it is our wish that all of us as a group will, by consultation and discussion, develop the best wisdom of the entire group.³⁶⁷

The initial faculty of the National War College consisted of sixteen officers and four civilians.³⁶⁸ The first civilian members of the faculty were "on loan" from Yale, Princeton, and other universities for one

³⁶⁶National Defense University, "Graduation Exercises: Classes of 1989."

³⁶⁷National Defense University, Archival Administrative Memoranda, Vol 1 and 2, 30-31. The document cited is the opening address by Admiral Hill.

³⁶⁸Keagle, "A Summary of Major Activities and Their Evolution," 18.

semester who had helped to prepare the curriculum.³⁶⁹ Other civilian faculty members on leave from their institutions were used through the mid-1950s. In the academic year 1954-1955, the first civilians were extended for a full year with the college. By 1962, the civilian faculty was extended for two years and in 1965, for four years on recommendation from the Board of Consultants.³⁷⁰ Civilian faculty members were first tenured in 1964.³⁷¹

The Joint Chiefs of Staff charter called for a representative number of faculty from each Service as well as civilians representing the State Department and other associate agencies and empowered the commandant to maintain the proper staff.³⁷² By 1955, the college began offering students faculty positions after

³⁶⁹National Defense University, Archival Administrative Memoranda, Vol 1 and 2, 31. The document cited is the opening address by Admiral Hill.

³⁷⁰Keagle, "A Summary of Major Activities and Their Evolution," 19. According to Masland and Radway, Soldiers and Scholars, 431-432, the use of civilian faculty on a term basis was first used by Admiral Hill and as the years passed the curriculum became more standardized. Therefore, the independent influence of civilians diminished. Some of the civilians were asked to return for a second semester for continuity.

³⁷¹Ibid.

³⁷²U.S. Joint Chiefs of Staff, 6 November 1947 Memorandum, Subject: Directive for the National War College.

graduation as well as other former graduates of the college.³⁷³ Since the first professoriate, the faculty more than doubled to approximately 35 members,³⁷⁴ and is maintained at a level to achieve a faculty to student ratio of not less than 1:3.5.³⁷⁵

Specific qualifications of the military faculty have included: military rank of lieutenant colonel or colonel (or Naval captains and commanders), academic expertise and teaching experience, outstanding military record, and joint service experience.³⁷⁶ The requirements for the civilian faculty are similar and in addition, a doctoral degree is desirable.³⁷⁷

Criticisms of the Faculty

³⁷³Kilpatrick, "Tomorrow's Leaders Learn Their Trade," 30.

³⁷⁴Keagle, "A Summary of Major Activities and Their Evolution," 20.

³⁷⁵U.S. Joint Chief of Staff, Military Education Policy Document, p. IV-B-3. According to this source, the purpose of this ratio is to allow the faculty to be fully effective as teachers and still participate meaningfully in research, professional symposia, the publication of papers or books, and personal professional development.

³⁷⁶U.S. Joint Chiefs of Staff, Military Education Policy Document, p. IV-A-3.

³⁷⁷Ibid., IV-A-5.

Many authors such as Masland and Radway³⁷⁸ consider the faculty of the National War College competent, professional officers, however, like their civilian counterparts, they have come under much scrutiny and criticism over their short history.³⁷⁹

Martin van Creveld concluded in his book that it is not clear how the faculty is selected and further, the faculty does not stay on the staff long enough to develop real expertise as teachers.³⁸⁰ The issue is not a new one. In the mid-1950s to the mid-1960s, the faculties were criticized for not teaching in the conventional sense. Military officers were not viewed as academicians. Faculties lacked teaching experience and had poorly developed scholarly qualifications,³⁸¹ or at least different scholarly qualifications. On their experience at the National War College, students reflected that the faculty "guided" the students rather

³⁷⁸Masland and Radway, Soldiers and Scholars, 427-428.

³⁷⁹The National War College is not an isolated case. The perceptions and criticisms noted above apply to other military war colleges as well.

³⁸⁰van Creveld, The Training of Officers, 81.

³⁸¹Campbell, "Progress and Problems in the War Colleges," 57; William H. Hessler, "The National War College--A Civilian Appraisal," United States Naval Institute Proceedings 82 (March 1956): 274.

than taught them by showing students where to find things, how to tackle problems in fields unfamiliar to them, and in short "how to educate themselves."³⁸²

R. R. Campbell concluded that it is difficult to assemble a faculty at a war college that has an edge on the students since both are at approximately the same point in their military careers.³⁸³ Because faculty and students have much of the same experience and backgrounds, it is often difficult to distinguish the faculty by reason of special educational or other qualifications.³⁸⁴ Simply put, the officer on the faculty is the one who happened to attend the college first.³⁸⁵

Another criticism of the National War College and other military institutions was the practice of selecting a large number of the faculty replacements from the most recent graduating class which has the same effects as the practice has in civilian institutions.³⁸⁶ The students

³⁸²Hessler, "The National War College," 274.

³⁸³Campbell, "Progress and Problems in the War Colleges," 57.

³⁸⁴Ibid., Masland and Radway, Soldiers and Scholars, 427.

³⁸⁵Masland and Radway, Soldiers and Scholars, 427.

³⁸⁶Masland and Radway, Soldiers and Scholars, 429.

lack experience in applying what they have just learned under field or staff conditions.³⁸⁷ In addition, they are selected as generalists--good all-round students--and not as experts in a specialized field of "professional science," such as politico-military affairs, logistics, or military research and development. This is compounded that they receive little or no training for their new assignment as a faculty member.³⁸⁸

A final criticism of professional military education is adaptation of a civilian college construct into a military environment. Seniority rather than experience usually, although not always, determines a faculty member's position.³⁸⁹ For example, the senior staff generally fill the positions on the principal committees or policy boards although more junior officers may have expertise that makes him or her more qualified to them.³⁹⁰ In addition, the faculty represent the acme of military-theoretical expertise, yet they are often not trusted to choose their own specialties, plan their own

³⁸⁷Katzenbach, "The Demotion of Professionalism at the War Colleges," 36.

³⁸⁸Ibid., 36-37; Campbell, "Progress and Problems in the War Colleges," 55-58.

³⁸⁹Masland and Radway, Soldiers and Scholars, 429-430.

³⁹⁰Ibid.

courses, or select their own texts.³⁹¹ The normal procedure is for the dean to issue both teachers and students photocopied extracts from the publications of others, which they are then told to "discuss."³⁹²

Despite the aforementioned criticisms of the National War College, in 1974, the American Council on Education noted that the quality of the faculty had improved greatly since the early 1970s through improved recruiting and selection.³⁹³ The use of visiting professors and the College Fellows program, beginning in 1971, also produced a teaching faculty with broader experience in prestigious academic and government positions and very significant academic qualifications. In the mid-1970s, 44% of the faculty possessed doctoral degrees in disciplines required by the college curriculum.³⁹⁴

More recently, the House Armed Service Committee's Panel on Military Education identified thirteen recommendations that pose improvement to the faculty of military education and eleven that focus on military war

³⁹¹van Creveld, The Training of Officers, 87.

³⁹²Ibid.

³⁹³American Council on Education, The National War College 1973-1974 Institutional Report, 5.

³⁹⁴Ibid.

colleges. They include:

1. The Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff must place a high priority on recruiting and maintaining highly qualified faculty to teach at joint service PME [Professional Military Education] colleges.
2. The military faculty should include three groups: officers with current, credible credentials in operations; specialists in important functional areas; and career educators. Incentives must exist to attract outstanding military officers in each of these groups.
3. The Services should develop programs to qualify military faculty members to ensure they are prepared professionally.
4. The services should develop a cadre of career educators for PME institutions similar to those at West Point. They should have an academic foundation, preferably a doctorate, in the area they are to teach as well as an exemplary military record based on solid performance.
5. Selected retired officers, particularly senior general and flag officers should contribute appreciably to the teaching of operational art and military strategy at the war colleges.
6. The PME faculty should have a high-quality civilian component in order for PME schools to attain a genuine "graduate" level of education.
7. As a goal, all members of the faculty at senior schools [war colleges] should have advanced degrees. The panel believes that a doctorate is desirable.
8. Stronger incentives are needed to attract a high-quality civilian faculty.³⁹⁵

³⁹⁵The panel suggested to change the current law similar to the flexibility that the Secretary of the Navy has under 10 USC 7478.

9. The student/faculty ratios at the professional military institutions should be sufficiently low to allow time for faculty development programs, research, and writing.

10. The services should study the feasibility of improving their faculties by using members of the service academy faculties on an exchange basis to teach at PME institutions.³⁹⁶

The Joint Chiefs of Staff responded to this 1989 report by publishing the Military Education Policy Document in 1990 which included many of the Panel's recommendations.³⁹⁷

Conclusions

These few pages have taken a stroll through the pages of history of the National War College. Its short history has seen changes in the mission, curriculum, faculties, and students. In sum, however, the purposes of the National War College have remained unchanged from those that Admiral Hill spoke of in September 1946. The future should continue the road of continuous improvement with the implementation of the recommendations from the 1989 Skelton Panel Report and enforcement of the Military Education Policy Document.

³⁹⁶Congress, House, Committee on Armed Services, Panel on Military Education, Report of the Panel on Military Education, 167-170.

³⁹⁷U.S. Joint Chiefs of Staff, Military Education Policy Document, pp. IV-A-3 to IV-A-5.

CHAPTER 5

THE CASE STUDY

Introduction

The case study is divided into two distinct parts. The first part analyzes the applicability of Alexander Flexner's model for a profession with the profession of arms through an examination of the National War College as a professional school. Then, the potential affects of the process of accreditation and accreditation itself on professional military education at the senior Service school level is analyzed using William Selden and Harry Porter's paradigm of what purposes accreditation serves institutions of higher education. The National War College is used as a case study to assess the appropriateness of the accreditation of these unique institutions of higher education because it is currently progressing through the lengthy process of accreditation and the subsequent award of a graduate degree to its students.

The Flexner Model

The Model Defined

Earl Cheit made reference in his book, The Useful

Arts and the Liberal Tradition to Alexander Flexner's classic paper on a model that constitutes a profession³⁹⁸ and the subsequent need for a professional school. The classic literature to which Cheit referred was a paper presented sixty years earlier to the forty-second annual session of the National Conference of Charities and Correction on 17 May 1915.³⁹⁹ Flexner identified the following six criteria in his model for a profession.

1. Professions are intellectual operations with large individual responsibility.
2. Because they are based on knowledge, professions must be learned.
3. Professions work up to a practical and definite end.
4. Professions possess an educationally communicable technique.
5. Self-organization is a trait of professions.
6. Altruism is a motivating force for professional work.⁴⁰⁰

³⁹⁸Cheit, The Useful Arts and the Liberal Tradition, 21-22.

³⁹⁹Alexander Flexner, "Is Social Work a Profession?" in Proceedings of the National Conference of Charities and Correction at the Forty-second Annual Session (Chicago: Hildmann Press), 576-590.

⁴⁰⁰Ibid, 581; Cheit, The Useful Arts and the Liberal Tradition, 21-22. In final section of his paper, Flexner identified a seventh factor, "professional spirit."

The Model Applied to the Profession of Arms

The military specialist is known by many descriptors that are synonymous and include military professional, security strategist, and the professional of arms. This section compares the characteristics of the Flexner model of a profession to the profession of arms to make some conclusion of whether the model applies to this less-widely written profession.⁴⁰¹

Intellectual. Like the other disciplines that Flexner regarded as professions, the profession of arms has an intellectual base or body of knowledge that carries with it a high level of personal responsibility. Notably, the president of National Defense University, Vice Admiral J. A. Baldwin, described the National War College experience as an intellectual undertaking.⁴⁰²

The characteristic of intellect in Flexner's model is clarified. Professional rank is "tied to the freedom of the individual to enjoy a freedom of scope, be one of thought, and that the individual be considered a 'risk

⁴⁰¹Lynton and Elman, New Priorities for the University, 103. These authors suggested academicians needed to further their knowledge of military schools and their relationship in the higher education community.

⁴⁰²Vice Admiral J. A. Baldwin, U.S. Navy, president of National Defense University, interview by author, 10 June 1992, Washington, DC, transcript, 6.

taker."⁴⁰³ At first glance, the military profession appears to be the antithesis of that definition, yet military officers are expected to think critically, be risk takers, and make difficult decisions that affect his or her organization.⁴⁰⁴

A former president of the National Defense University, retired Vice Admiral Marmaduke Bayne, testified before the House Armed Services Committee's Panel on Military Education in 1988 and stated, "the National War College seeks to guide the intellect into inquiry and establish concepts, ideas, and original thought."⁴⁰⁵ Similarly, Flexner tied the intellectual character of the profession to the ability to think.⁴⁰⁶ Senior leaders of professional military education

⁴⁰³Flexner, "Is Social Work a Profession," 578-579.

⁴⁰⁴These traits are emphasized and nurtured in professional military education from programs like the Air Force Squadron Officer School at Air University, forward. The author is a graduate of Squadron Officer School.

⁴⁰⁵Congress, House, Committee on Armed Services, Professional Military Education: Hearings before the Panel on Military Education, 936. Referenced material was excerpted from the testimony of Vice Admiral Marmaduke G. Bayne, U.S. Navy (retired), a former president of the National Defense University who testified before the Panel on 17 May 1988. He further testified that one does not just "learn it [war] out of books. . .it has to be studied, it has to be studied in depth," p. 954.

⁴⁰⁶Flexner, "Is Social Work a Profession," 578-579.

postulate that it is the professional military officer's responsibility to learn how to think⁴⁰⁷ rather than what to think.⁴⁰⁸ The National War College teaches the students how to conceptualize and integrate all the elements of national power (military, economic, moral, political, etc).⁴⁰⁹ General Carl Vuono, Army Chief of Staff, linked the profession's experience with formal education and said, "our officers must understand our doctrine and be capable of carrying out their responsibilities to assure mission accomplishment."⁴¹⁰

In an interview in June 1992, Major General Gerald Stadler, commandant of the National War College, discussed the intellectual aspect of the National War

⁴⁰⁷Congressman Ike Skelton, Representative from Missouri, 4th District, and Chair of the Panel on Military Education, U.S. House Armed Services Committee (HASC), interview by author, 8 June 1992, Rayburn House, Washington, DC, transcript, 6; Baldwin, interview by author, 6.

⁴⁰⁸Major General Gerald P. Stadler, U.S. Army, commandant of the National War College, interview by author, 18 June 1992, Washington, DC, transcript, 12. General Stadler retired from the Army after the 1992 commencement exercises.

⁴⁰⁹Baldwin, interview by author, 6.

⁴¹⁰Congress, House, Committee on Armed Services, Professional Military Education: Hearings Before the Panel on Military Education, 1369. Referenced material was excerpted from the testimony of General Carl E. Vuono, U.S. Army, the Army Chief of Staff who testified before the Panel on 28 July 1988.

College by saying, "if you're educating people how to think, you are going to have a constant stream of differing opinions, differing ideas emerging in the classroom from both the faculty and the students."⁴¹¹

In sum, the profession of arms is intellectual inasmuch as it uses its professional schools, like the National War College, to "put them [the students] in an environment that will cause them to think in a broader term."⁴¹² The profession has a large individual responsibility to the peace of the United States, the safety of its citizens, and a responsibility to international affairs.

Learned. Flexner included this characteristic in his original model for a profession and called it an obvious characteristic of intellectual character. He said that "the second criterion of the profession is therefore its learned character, and this characteristic is so essential that the adjective learned really adds nothing to the noun profession."⁴¹³

The military profession is like the other

⁴¹¹Ibid.

⁴¹²Colonel L. Kirk Lewis, U. S. Army, dean of students of the National War College, interview by author, 17 June 1992, Washington, DC, tape recording.

⁴¹³Flexner, "Is Social Work a Profession," 579.

professions that Flexner referenced. The intellectual characteristic, evidenced above, is therefore learned. Of note with respect to the learned characteristic, is that it is variety and experimentation in the classroom that adds to the learning experience. The dean of faculty and academic programs at the National War College, Colonel Roy Stafford, linked the importance of new ideas and techniques to the quality of learning in the classroom.⁴¹⁴

Practical. Flexner made the distinction that practicality was required of professions because "no profession can be merely academic and theoretic."⁴¹⁵ The profession of arms' academic base is tied to the preservation of peace, maintaining the national security, and when the use of military force is required that peace be restored through victory.⁴¹⁶ That base is traced to the early architects of the profession of arms who found

⁴¹⁴Colonel Roy W. Stafford, U.S. Air Force, dean of faculty and academic programs for the National War College, interview by author, 15 June 1992, Washington, DC, tape recording. Colonel Stafford retired after the 1991-1992 academic year after nine years at the college.

⁴¹⁵Flexner, "Is Social Work a Profession," 579.

⁴¹⁶Skelton, interview by author, 3. Congressman Skelton's comment (paraphrased) explained his assessment of the verdict of how the National War College's success is measured.

clear evidence that the United States needed to have a cadre of senior military and civilian officials who knew foreign policy, defense policy, intelligence policy, and information policy.⁴¹⁷

A comparison of the National War College with Georgetown University's professional Master's of Arts program in National Security Studies is used to demonstrate the practicality of the profession. The program at Georgetown University is a civilian contemporary of the National War College. There, students earn a terminal degree designed for people who are "in the business" of national security rather than people who want to get a Ph.D. in national security for the purpose of teaching or academia.⁴¹⁸ Similarly, the purpose of federal professional military education is for those in the business of the "art and science of employing all of the political, psychological, economic, industrial and military resources of the United States to

⁴¹⁷Colonel Robert C. Hughes, U. S. Air Force, associate dean of faculty and academic programs for the National War College, interview by author, 15 June 1992, Washington, DC, tape recording.

⁴¹⁸Dr. Steven P. Gibert, professor of government and director of the National Security Studies Program at Georgetown University, interview by author, 10 June 1992, Washington, DC, tape recording.

afford maximum support of national security policies."⁴¹⁹

On whether the profession of arms is practical, Congressman Ike Skelton, chair of the Panel on Military Education of the House Armed Services Committee, made a comparison between the academics of the National War College and a more familiar professional school; a law school. He said:

These are not courses in memory. These are courses in learning facts then applying the facts, how to think, [and] how to find out information you don't have. The moment that someone graduates from law school, they know more about law at that moment than they'll ever know in their life, but are they good lawyers? Probably not. Because they don't know how to think and how to use it. They will forget a lot of the law that they learned in law school, but hopefully they will learn how to think and to find out the answers to their questions. If a commander or a staff officer can ask the right questions at the right time, prior to battle, or in their putting together a strategic plan, that's what counts. You can come up with the answers, but it's asking the right questions that's terribly difficult.⁴²⁰

Within the construct of the military and federal

⁴¹⁹Congress, House, Committee on Armed Services, Professional Military Education: Hearings before the Panel on Military Education, 1403. Referenced material was excerpted from the prepared statement included in the testimony of Admiral William J. Crowe, Jr., U.S. Navy, (retired), former Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff who testified before the Panel on 11 August 1988.

⁴²⁰Skelton, interview with author, 5. Congressman Skelton is a law school graduate.

civilians that participate in the professional military education enterprise includes senior leaders who provide military advice to political leaders including the President of the United States and his or her national security advisors and the Congress⁴²¹ which has been evident throughout history and most recently during Operations Desert Shield and Desert Storm.⁴²²

Communicable technique. Intellectual, learned, practical, and then, the profession's body of knowledge must be communicable in a method to get the fullest possible benefit from the training provided.⁴²³ The body of knowledge and the skill of the profession of arms is transferred or communicated through an education process.⁴²⁴ The National Defense University recognizes

⁴²¹Congress, House, Committee on Armed Services, Professional Military Education: Hearings Before the Panel on Military Education, 1255. Referenced material was excerpted from the testimony of General Andrew J. Goodpaster, U.S. Army (retired), former Supreme Allied Commander, Europe, who testified before the Panel on 21 June 1988.

⁴²²Among many others, the most senior leaders, the National Security Advisor and Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff were graduates of senior professional military education, notably the National War College.

⁴²³Flexner, "Is Social Work a Profession," 580.

⁴²⁴Dale E. Zeimer, faculty member of the National War College, interview by author, 15 June 1992, Washington, DC, tape recording. Mr. Zeimer is a senior executive service employee with the Central Intelligence

that education, as compared to training, is to guide the student to inquiry, question, and thought.⁴²⁵ Mr. Alan Smith, a faculty member of the National War College, summarized by saying:

There is a core of knowledge about how to think, about the formulation of national security policy and how to translate that to diplomatic initiatives, economic initiatives, and defense programs and policies; and then how to execute those.⁴²⁶

A variety of methods are used at the National War College to communicate the body of knowledge to its students. The curriculum is delivered by methods similar to those at more traditional graduate schools such as lectures, seminars, and case studies.⁴²⁷ However, the

Agency who was on a two-year assignment with the National War College faculty.

⁴²⁵Congress, House, Committee on Armed Services, Professional Military Education: Hearings before the Panel on Military Education, 936. Referenced material was excerpted from the testimony of Vice Admiral Marmaduke G. Bayne, U.S. Navy (retired), who testified before the Panel on 17 May 1988; National Defense University, National Defense University 1992-1993 Catalogue, 27.

⁴²⁶Alan B. Smith, faculty member of the National War College, interview by author, 15 June 1992, Washington, DC, tape recording. Like Mr. Zeimer, Mr. Smith is a senior executive level employee with the Central Intelligence Agency.

⁴²⁷James V. Dixon, faculty member of the National War College, interview by author, 15 June 1992, Washington, DC, tape recording; Lewis, interview with author; Stadler, interview with author, 12; National Defense University, National Defense University Catalogue

technique of facilitating the learning experience is as diverse as the faculty members themselves. Each individual puts his or her own spin on the course. Some divide their class into small groups, create panel discussions, and others initiate discussion by introducing controversial materials.⁴²⁸ Methodologies used at the National War College that are less familiar to more traditional colleges include distinguished lectures⁴²⁹ and end-of-year exercises designed to put theory to practice by testing what the students learned through the curriculum.⁴³⁰ Alan Smith, a faculty member

1992-1993, 27.

⁴²⁸Dr. Paul H. B. Godwin, associate dean of faculty and academic programs of National War College, interview by author, 15 June 1992, Washington, DC, tape recording; Lilley, interview by author. For example, several interviewees commented that following a core lecture there are 12 to 15 seminars and each classroom will be different.

⁴²⁹Gibert, interview with author; National War College, "National War College Self-Appraisal," 11. In the regional studies program students get the opportunity to meet key leaders, foreign affairs officials, and senior military officers. Similarly, in the Georgetown University program, similar distinguished leaders speak to students. Both institutions have the benefit of being located in Washington, DC and therefore, quality speakers that peer institutions have less access. This point was reinforced in interviews by the author with Steven Pappas of the Department of Education and Henry Spille, vice president of the American Council on Education.

⁴³⁰Lewis, interview with author; National Defense University, National Defense University Catalogue 1992-1993, 27.

at the National War College, explained the objectives of the end-of-year exercises.⁴³¹ The exercises include students from the National War College and the Industrial College of the Armed Forces.⁴³² The scenario uses the projected defense appropriations budget for fiscal year 2000. Forces and weaponry are employed using the FY 2000 base-line less 10-20% for exercise purposes. A series of regional crisis were developed to see how well the forces that were procured meet potential political and military situations from the Middle East, the Northwest Pacific, and others in a war-gaming scenario.⁴³³

Self-organization. In his original paper, Flexner related self-organization to the composition of a brotherhood or a medieval caste.⁴³⁴ He emphasized that self-organization encompassed the social attributes as well as the professional aspects of the lives of the members of the profession to form a professional

⁴³¹Smith, interview by author. Mr. Smith was responsible for setting up the exercises.

⁴³²Ibid. The Industrial College of the Armed Forces is a sister college of the National War College as part of the National Defense University, see Chapter 4, which is also seeking accreditation.

⁴³³Ibid.

⁴³⁴Flexner, "Is Social Work a Profession?" 580.

nucleus.⁴³⁵ Few professions mirror the concept of the brotherhood fostered by the military. That characteristic is a key component of a military organization and is the life-blood of the military's success on the battlefield. That brotherhood is formed at entry into the military and nurtured throughout a soldier, sailor, airman, or Marine's career.⁴³⁶

If self-organization is a trait of a profession and professional schools cultivate brotherhoods of physicians, lawyers, and engineers; then the National War College construct further encourages the growth of the brotherhood of military officers through two unique approaches. The first approach is fostered through the uniqueness of the school. Unlike other professional schools, the National War College enrolls one class of 170 students in the fall and graduates that class in the following spring.⁴³⁷ Students matriculate and move through the curriculum at the same rate and complete the

⁴³⁵Ibid.

⁴³⁶The author is a career military officer who has served in the enlisted corps and the officer corps. He has completed basic military training and Officer Training School and is a graduate of Squadron Officer School at Air University as well as several other Air Force professional courses.

⁴³⁷Stadler, interview by author, 12; National Defense University, National Defense University Catalogue 1992-1993, 11.

program at the same time. This process fosters self-organization and a professional bonding by the entire student body.⁴³⁸

In addition, the National War College dean of students, Colonel L. Kirk Lewis, elaborated on the fostering of the brotherhood of arms at the National War College in a comparison to the Kennedy School of Government at Harvard University.⁴³⁹ He made reference to the Friday group projects at Harvard which had the sole purpose of networking and fostering the student/faculty brotherhood. Similarly, the National War College fosters the development of personal relationships and change the way students relate to each other.⁴⁴⁰ In another example, Lewis suggested that the close, effective relationship between Chairman of the Joint Chiefs, General Colin Powell and General Charles Horner, commander of the Allied Air Forces in Operation Desert Storm, was fostered by their experiences at the senior

⁴³⁸Lewis, interview by author.

⁴³⁹Ibid. Colonel Lewis was a research fellow at Harvard University's Kennedy School of Government and has been the dean of students since 1989. He is also the executive officer for the commandant of the National War College.

⁴⁴⁰Ibid.

Service schools.⁴⁴¹

Altruism. The humanity and selflessness of the profession is the final primary trait that Flexner included in his classic model.

Like self-organization, the profession of arms certainly is altruistic since military men and women are sworn by their oath to "protect and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic."⁴⁴² That altruism is well-documented in the pages of American history by the many men and women who gave the supreme sacrifice for their country and the ideals of our society.

The professional military education system, including the National War College, plays an important part in fostering altruism within the profession. In a statement to the House Panel on Military Education, General Andrew Goodpaster defined the purpose of the professional military education system as "help[ing] to prepare officers to perform their duties in safeguarding our Country's security in a dangerous and unstable and

⁴⁴¹Ibid. During Operation Desert Shield/Desert Storm, General Horner was a Lieutenant General (3 stars) promoted in 1992 to General (4 stars) and subsequently assigned as commander of the Air Force Space Command at Peterson Air Force Base, Colorado.

⁴⁴²A portion of the oath of office by military members.

often unpredictable world."⁴⁴³ In an interview with the author, Congressman Ike Skelton, made the following comment on the purpose of the National War College. "The real verdict is how well they [the graduates] do on the battlefield. In a Cold War, in other words, the goal is to prepare for war, fight the war, or deter war, and I hope it is the later."⁴⁴⁴ Major General Gerald P. Stadler, commandant of the National War College, added that the students of the college were prepared to "handle the future and to even shape and influence the future of the United States."⁴⁴⁵ This is a distinction between professional military education and the curriculum of other professional schools as former president of National Defense University, Vice Admiral Marmaduke Bayne, said, "He [the student] is seeking constantly the

⁴⁴³Congress, House, Committee on Armed Services, Professional Military Education: Hearings Before the Panel on Military Education, 1254. Referenced material was excerpted from the testimony of General Andrew Goodpaster, U.S. Army (retired), who testified before the Panel on 21 June 1988. General Goodpaster was also a former commandant of the National War College (Congress, House, Committee on Armed Services, Professional Military Education: Hearings Before the Panel on Military Education, 1253. Referenced material was excerpted from the testimony of Congressman Ike Skelton, Chair of the Panel on Military Education in his opening remarks to the Panel on 12 June 1988.

⁴⁴⁴Skelton, interview by author, 3.

⁴⁴⁵Stadler, interview by author, 21.

tenets to do his best to prevent war; yet he is constantly aware that his objective is subject to failure. That places him in a rather different position."⁴⁴⁶

The research clearly revealed that the profession of arms fits Alexander Flexner's model for a profession. The body of knowledge, methods of communication, and the design of the profession is dissimilar with other more traditional professions primarily because of the military organization and hierarchy. Some interviewed did not view the profession of arms through the identification of the National War College as a professional school as they viewed the professions of medicine or law.⁴⁴⁷ However, they still reasoned that it was a profession because of the body of knowledge that is transferred from one generation of military leaders to another.⁴⁴⁸

⁴⁴⁶Congress, House, Committee on Armed Services, Professional Military Education: Hearings Before the Panel on Military Education, 936. Referenced material was excerpted from the testimony of Vice Admiral Marmaduke G. Bayne, U.S. Navy (retired) who testified before the Panel on 17 May 1988.

⁴⁴⁷Patricia P. Evans, vice chair of the Assembly of Specialized Accrediting Bodies of the Council on Postsecondary Accreditation and executive director of the Council on Education for Public Health, interview by author, 10 June 1992, Washington, DC, transcript, 2; Smith, interview by author; Zeimer, interview by author.

⁴⁴⁸Ibid.

The hearings that have been referenced of the House Armed Forces Committee's Panel on Military Education⁴⁴⁹ is nearly a 1,500 page volume of testimony which provides thoughts by eminent scholars, former military general and Navy flag officers, and former senior leaders of the Department of Defense. It is important, therefore, to provide a short summary of its implications. In that document is testimony which casts dissenting opinion on the professional military education system's approach or curriculum or methodologies. However, in each case, the conviction that the military is a profession that must be reckoned with is supported. The hearings, of course, led to the Panel's 1989 Report of the Panel on Military Education⁴⁵⁰ and subsequently several Government Accounting Office reports on professional military education. The outcome was identification and policy formulation by the Congress, the Joint Staff, and the Services to make improvements to the entire professional military education system.

The research which has been synthesized above is

⁴⁴⁹Congress, House, Committee on Armed Services, Professional Military Education: Hearings Before the Panel on Military Education, passim.

⁴⁵⁰Congress, House, Committee on Armed Services, Panel on Military Education, Report of the Panel on Military Education.

shared by those interviewed throughout the research process with regard to the categorization of the military profession fitting the construct of a profession. When defining a discipline, a range of definitions come to mind as to whether or not the discipline fits the model for a profession.⁴⁵¹ Allan Millett, associate director of the Merston Center, for example, used the following clarification of what a profession is:

[The military] should bear responsibility for the development of their own expertise, to think about the relationships with the client they serve, the Nation, and develop their own sense of uniqueness and corporateness.

Education, it seems to me, is very much a part of the process of professionalism, and it requires a continuing and deepening effort to build expertise, social responsibility and corporateness.

We very often hear of the term "art and science" applied to the military profession. I think that it is probably appropriate.⁴⁵²

In sum, Flexner's classic model appears to have relevance in examining whether professions meet an established model for defining a profession. In the case

⁴⁵¹Congress, House, Committee on Armed Services, Professional Military Education: Hearings Before the Panel on Military Education, 1099. Referenced material was excerpted from the testimony of Dr. Allan Millett, professor of history, Ohio State University and associate director of the Merston Center who testified before the Panel on 2 June 1988.

⁴⁵²Ibid.

of the profession of arms, Dr. Millett's comments above have strong threads of the profession being intellectual, learned, practical, having self-organization, is communicable, and suggestions of altruism which further support that the profession of arms is indeed a legitimate profession and that Flexner's model for a profession has legitimacy for defining a profession.

The Selden and Porter Paradigm

The Paradigm Defined

A brief history of the accreditation process of colleges and universities in the United States was provided in Chapter 3. William Selden and Harry Porter published a paper in 1977, through the Council on Postsecondary Accreditation, that conceptualized the purposes of the accreditation process based on the previous 75 years. Their paradigm identified the following three limited purposes served by accreditation:

1. Identifying institutions and/or programs of study that meet minimum standards.
2. Stimulating the raising of standards, and the related activity of encouraging educational improvement.
3. Assisting in the protection of institutions and/or programs of study against internal or external deleterious forces.⁴⁵³

⁴⁵³Selden and Porter, Accreditation: Its Purposes and Uses, 17.

To test the paradigm proposed by Selden and Porter, their purposes of accreditation are examined in the case study of the National War College.

The Accreditation of the National War College

The purpose of this research is not to second-guess or determine whether the National War College will be accredited by the Middle States Association of Colleges and Schools. Certainly the author is not qualified to make any assumptions on the future accreditation of an institution. However, because the hypothesis of this research speculates that the National War College will be accredited, this section reviews the self-study performed by the National War College in November 1991 as well as the report submitted by the subcommittee of the National Advisory Committee of the Department of Education in March 1992 after their site visit to the National War College.⁴⁵⁴

⁴⁵⁴National War College, "National War College Self-Appraisal," November 1991, Washington, DC. The self-study was provided courtesy of Colonel Robert Hughes, associate dean of faculty and academic programs, National War College. The report of the subcommittee of the National Advisory Committee was provided by Steven Pappas, executive director of the National Advisory Committee for Accreditation and Institutional Eligibility of the U.S. Department of Education. At the time of this writing, the National War College is in the process of accreditation and has completed the process up to and including the site visit by the Department of Education's subcommittee of the National Advisory Committee for

The self-study focused on the institution's mission, governance, administration, academic program, faculty, students, student services, outcomes assessments, publications,⁴⁵⁵ academic freedom, and institutional integrity.⁴⁵⁶ Each area was evaluated by a college committee which was chaired by the university director of academic plans and policy and under the direction of an associate dean of faculty and academic programs of the National War College.⁴⁵⁷ An appraisal of 17 separate areas accentuating both the positive aspects of the college as well as areas for improvement was the outcome.⁴⁵⁸ Further, the self-study was well-documented with 35 exhibits and several tables and figures. The exhibits included biographies of the Board of Visitors members, course descriptions, photographs, Department of

Accreditation and Institutional Eligibility. Congressional legislation is also required before any military institution can award degrees (Skelton, interview by author, 1-2).

⁴⁵⁵National Defense University has a university press that publishes work for the National War College as well as their other colleges and defense agencies.

⁴⁵⁶National War College, "National War College Self-Appraisal," i.

⁴⁵⁷Ibid., iii. The National War College associate dean of faculty and academic programs was Air Force Colonel Robert Hughes.

⁴⁵⁸Godwin, interview by author; Hughes, interview by author.

Defense and Congressional reports, as well as several committee and special reports.⁴⁵⁹

Assessment of the self-study was made by a visit from a subcommittee of the National Advisory Committee for Accreditation and Institutional Eligibility of the U.S. Department of Education 22-24 March 1992. This committee was chaired by Dr. Myrna Matranga, professor of education at the University of Nevada at Reno. Sister Mary Andrew Matesich, president of Ohio Dominican College and Dr. Bernard Fryshman, professor of physics at New York Institute of Technology were site visit members. The committee was assisted by Steven Pappas and James Dougherty of the U.S. Department of Education.⁴⁶⁰

The on-site visit included visits with university and college administrators, Board of Visitors members, the Joint Staff, faculty members, and students. In addition, student essays, course syllabi, Board of Visitors meeting minutes, academic programs, and library resources were assessed. After their extensive review, the site team members unanimously concluded that the National War College graduate program met the standards

⁴⁵⁹National War College, "National War College Self-Appraisal," v.

⁴⁶⁰U.S. Department of Education, "Report of an On-site Visit," by a subcommittee of the National Advisory Committee, 22-24 March 1992.

for a Master's degree as compared to similar programs in non-federal institutions of higher education.⁴⁶¹

Further, the report found that academic freedom was fostered and the governance of the college was acceptable meeting minimum standards normally found in peer non-federal institutions.⁴⁶²

In a discussion of the accreditation of the National War College, an important issue is raised; that being whether a public or private college or university can fulfill the needs of the military through an existing program. Federal degree-granting institutions must pass that test before the Department of Education can recommend their approval for accreditation or degree-granting authority to the Congress.⁴⁶³ Currently, about a dozen non-federal institutions have degree programs in National Security or Defense Studies from California to Boston University including Georgetown University in

⁴⁶¹Ibid.

⁴⁶²Ibid. Dr. Marianne R. Phelps, senior associate of the Council on Postsecondary Accreditation, interview by author, 11 June 1992, Washington, DC, tape recording. Dr. Phelps believed that the National War College should be accredited insofar as they meet governance criteria.

⁴⁶³U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, "Federal Policy Governing the Granting of Academic Degrees by Federal Agencies and Institutions," 23 December 1954, courtesy of the executive director, U.S. Department of Education, National Advisory Committee for Accreditation and Institutional Eligibility.

Washington, DC.⁴⁶⁴ At first glance, it might be concluded that these institutions could fulfill the military's needs, however, clearly the two types of programs are different. In an interview with Dr. Steven Gibert, several differences were raised.⁴⁶⁵ The first is that a different clientele was served by Georgetown University. The average age of the students was 30, ten years younger than those attending senior Service schools, and consisted of students who were in or sought a career within the federal government working with national security or defense at a variety of agencies and Congress.⁴⁶⁶ National War College students come to the school with twenty or more years of experience in the national security arena (whether they come from the military departments, State Department, or other federal

⁴⁶⁴Gibert, interview by author.

⁴⁶⁵Ibid.; Congress, House, Committee on Armed Services, Professional Military Education: Hearings Before the Panel on Military Education, 806-806. Referenced material was excerpted from the testimony of Mr. Robert Murray, director of national security programs at the John F. Kennedy School of Government, Harvard University and former undersecretary of the Navy who testified before the Panel on 10 May 1988. On a question by Congressman Skelton to Mr. Murray if Harvard (in a program which military officers attend at the senior Service school level) could better meet the needs of the National War College. The answer was no because of the need for classified materials as well as the use of war gaming and interaction with other leaders.

⁴⁶⁶Gibert, interview by author.

agencies). Further, and this is the key point, according to Dr. Gibert, the curriculum at the National War College was militarily based using Joint-service doctrine along with other national security agencies.⁴⁶⁷ This conclusion was supported by the subcommittee of the National Advisory Committee of the Department of Education which found:

The degrees cannot be obtained in existing non-federal institutions for the following reasons:

The programs are based on a joint multi-service perspective in order to educate student bodies which include members of all the military services as well as civilians with high-level experience in federal agencies. Their focus on the role of all the services and related agencies in national security decision making and resource strategy could not be duplicated elsewhere.

The programs require constant revision to stay current and immediate in rapidly changing circumstances, a feature which is essential to train future decisionmakers. This requires access to the views of top domestic and foreign policymakers and to current data from the Department of Defense and other agencies as well as certain classified materials. It also depends on the NDU's [National Defense University] extensive network of contacts with government agencies, think tanks, and private corporations.⁴⁶⁸

There are three additional criteria that the U. S. Department of Education must validate in their site

⁴⁶⁷Ibid.

⁴⁶⁸U.S. Department of Education, "Report of an On-site Visit."

visit. Those criteria are:

- a. The conferring of the authority to grant graduate degrees in question is essential to the accomplishment of the program objectives of the applying agency.
- b. The graduate program conducted by the applying agency meets the standards for the degree or degrees in question which are met by similar programs in non-Federal institutions of higher education.
- c. That the administration of the graduate program concerned is such that the faculty and students be free to conduct their research activities as objectively, as freely, and in as unbiased a manner as that found in other non-Federal institutions of higher education. The existence of an advisory committee of educators from regularly-constituted institutions shall be regarded as some evidence of the safeguarding of freedom of inquiry. Accreditation by an appropriate accrediting body, if such exists, shall be regarded as another safeguard.⁴⁶⁹

The U. S. Department of Education is responsible for the validation process of federal institutions acting in the same capacity as a state department of education or higher education body that validates degree-granting authority or the chartering of existence.⁴⁷⁰ The

⁴⁶⁹U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, "Federal Policy Governing the Granting of Academic Degrees by Federal Agencies and Institutions," 23-25; U.S. Department of Education, "Report of an On-site Visit;" Pappas, interview by author, 2-3.

⁴⁷⁰Steven G. Pappas, executive director of the National Advisory Committee on Accreditation and Institutional Eligibility of the U.S. Department of Education, interview by author, 10 June 1992, interview by author, transcript, 5-7; Congressman Ike Skelton of

criteria of the Federal Policy Governing the Granting of Academic Degrees by Federal Agencies and Institutions was validated by the site visit.⁴⁷¹

In addition to the Department of Education, the American Council on Education shares the responsibility of ensuring federal institutions seeking degree-granting authority are within the parameters of the 1954 policy.⁴⁷² The American Council on Education works closely with the Department of Education in that role. In fact, the American Council on Education acts as the coordinating agency with other national higher education associations that have an interest in the validation process of approving degree-granting authority to federal

the 4th District of Missouri and chair of the House Armed Services Committee Panel on Military Education, in his opening statement before the panel, 12 May 1992, Washington, DC, released by the office of Congressman Skelton. The process includes the site-visit and approval by the Secretary of Education which was established in 1989 as two of the three criteria when a federal institution sought degree-granting authority. The third criteria is approval from the appropriate regional accrediting organization. Of course, legislation must be passed through the Panel on Military Education to award degrees (Skelton, interview by author, 1-2).

⁴⁷¹U.S. Department of Education, "Report of an On-site Visit."

⁴⁷²Henry A. Spille, vice president of the American Council on Education, interview by author, 10 June 1992, Washington, DC, tape recording.

institutions.⁴⁷³ The associations represented by the American Council on Education include the National Association of State Land Grant Colleges and Universities, the American Association of State Colleges and Universities, itself, and other organizations which believe they have an interest.⁴⁷⁴ For example, when the Naval War College sought degree-granting authority, the National Association of Independent Colleges and Universities joined this group because Salve Regina (one of their member institutions) opposed the granting of degrees. As a "voting block," this joint body expresses concern if they believe that the degree being sought can be awarded by a civilian institution.⁴⁷⁵

When the American Council on Education or other national associations choose not to oppose the degree-granting authority of a federal institution, they simply take no action. For example, they chose not to attend the open forum of the Naval War College because the American Council on Education has evaluated a number of

⁴⁷³Ibid.

⁴⁷⁴Ibid.

⁴⁷⁵Ibid. With the Naval War College, this group believed that Salve Regina College could provide the degree jointly with the Naval War College and apposed the process. The Naval War College did receive their degree-granting authority by the Department of Education.

courses and programs of study at the college and is familiar with the nature of the content and quality. "Those discussions went beyond One Dupont Circle to Steve Pappas at the Department of Education."⁴⁷⁶

Once Congress gives approval for the National War College or any federal institution to grant degrees⁴⁷⁷ the regional accreditation agency is invited to conduct their site visit.⁴⁷⁸ That process was established by the House Armed Services Committee Panel on Military Education in 1989 when the Naval War College sought accreditation.⁴⁷⁹ Once the school has meet the accreditation requirements of the regional accreditation bodies, the Panel considers the following:

1. How degree granting authority will affect the military education mission of the school; and
2. How this will affect the number of officers obtaining advanced degrees from civilian

⁴⁷⁶Ibid. One Dupont Circle is the location of the American Council on Education and many of the national associations in higher education. The Department of Education conducts an open forum for interested parties to testify both pro and con on the degree-granting authority for an institution. Noted earlier, Mr. Pappas is the executive director of the National Advisory Committee for Accreditation and Institutional Eligibility for the Department of Education.

⁴⁷⁷Skelton, interview by author, 1-2.

⁴⁷⁸Ibid., Pappas, interview by author, 20-21.

⁴⁷⁹Skelton in his opening statement before the Panel (See footnote #470).

schools.⁴⁸⁰

As an item of note, recently, the U.S. General Accounting Office has conducted reports for the Panel on professional military education across Service and Joint Staff lines as a follow-up to the Panel's 1989 report.⁴⁸¹

The National War College is viewed as a highly specialized institution⁴⁸² and therefore in a discussion of accreditation, the issue of regional versus specialized accreditation is raised.⁴⁸³

As discussed in Chapter 3, specialized accreditation has been part of the accreditation process since the

⁴⁸⁰Ibid.

⁴⁸¹Congress, House, Committee on Armed Services, Panel on Military Education, Report of the Panel on Military Education; General Accounting Office, "Military Education: Implementing of Recommendations at the National War College, June 1992, Washington, DC: U.S. General Accounting Office. This report is one of several reports prepared by the GAO and is noted here for purposes of illustrating the impact of the Congress on federal institutions and not for the purpose of analyzing whether the institutions have implemented the recommendations of the Panel.

⁴⁸²Phelps, interview by author.

⁴⁸³There currently is no specialized accreditation body that would encompass the National War College curriculum, so in the interviews where this issue was discussed, it was assumed that an organization did exist and included a range from all federal degree-granting institutions to only those who provided degrees in professional military education.

early 1900s and fosters excellence in the development of criteria for professional education. Today, specialized accreditation agencies are generally formed to oversee the curriculum of professions whose focus serves the health and public safety needs of our society.⁴⁸⁴ Further, specialized accreditation agencies are often linked to licensure or certification by a national regulatory body.

Since military professional schools are typically single purpose institutions, regional accreditation is better suited for the accreditation of the overall institution⁴⁸⁵ and should be the first step regardless whether specialized accreditation is sought.⁴⁸⁶

There was strong opinion concerning the appropriateness of a specialized accreditation agency that would encompass professional military education. As noted above, Steven Pappas, executive director of the National Advisory Committee for Accreditation and Institutional Eligibility for the Department of Education, is responsible for the preliminary committee

⁴⁸⁴Evans, interview by author, 3. Ms. Evans noted that there are a smaller number of specialized agencies that fit into categories other than health and public safety.

⁴⁸⁵Phelps, interview by author.

⁴⁸⁶Evans, interview by author.

review of federal degree-granting institutions. He had serious concern with a specialized accreditation agency that only consisted of institutions similar to the National War College.⁴⁸⁷ He summarized his concern as follows:

I think the strength of the process itself, of the accreditation itself, is as we've talked about and that is to prevent the insularity, the isolation, and the inbreeding. And what helps to prevent that is the outside interaction with your peers.

Further,

Now you can say, well you can do the exact same thing with the military accreditation agency and I would say, 'yes, you might [emphasized] be able to do that, but since the civilian accrediting bodies already do it with all the high marks that accrediting bodies have -- let's say through the organization of the regional accrediting bodies or even some of the specialized agencies -- I think it's something a military accrediting body will not be able to give them.⁴⁸⁸

In addition, concerns for objectivity in visits to the institution and critical analysis of the self-studies by those who were not typical academicians familiar with the accreditation process were raised.⁴⁸⁹ The director

⁴⁸⁷Pappas, interview by author, 21-25.

⁴⁸⁸Ibid., 23.

⁴⁸⁹Ibid. However, in other federal degree-granting institutions, specialized accreditation is appropriate. In the case of the Uniformed Services University of the Health Sciences, this institution is accreditation by regional and specialized accreditation bodies. It is a

of academic affairs at National Defense University added that the accreditation process in place seemed appropriate. Although the National War College was basically a military institution, the existing agencies have the experts who are familiar with the process of accreditation.⁴⁹⁰ Therefore, there does not appear to be good justification for the establishment of a separate agency to maintain regulatory control for the accreditation process of these types of institutions. Finally, and possibly most importantly, the credibility of such a specialized accreditation body among the higher education community would be at stake.⁴⁹¹

The Paradigm Applied to the National War College

This section compares the aforementioned purposes of

military medical school located in Bethesda, Maryland, (Evans, interview by author, 5).

⁴⁹⁰Colonel Joseph L. Greenlee, U.S. Army, director of academic affairs of National Defense University, interview by author, 11 June 1992, Washington, DC, tape recording. Colonel Greenlee added that in lieu of a specialized accreditation agency, the Joint Staff does provide similar oversight of National Defense University to ensure the mission and curriculum meet established standards.

⁴⁹¹Phelps, interview by author. Dr. Phelps added that because attendance to these types of institutions is critical to an officer's career, the benefit is in terms of how the college is viewed in other settings and a specialized accreditation body would not be beneficial in this case.

accreditation to the National War College by interpreting whether the college will benefit from each area. In addition, specific examples of will show how the college has already been the beneficiary of the process of the self-study and site visit by the Department of Education.

Identification of Institutions Meeting Minimum Standards. The application of accreditation standards to new or prospective colleges and universities is clearly the most important benefit of the accreditation process.⁴⁹² Those minimum standards are measured and examined through the criteria in the self-study and subsequent site visit by the regional and specialized (as applicable) accreditation bodies.

In Chapter 4, the evolution of accreditation standards from primarily quantitative standards to qualitative measurements that focus on the mission of the college or university and how well that institution carries out its mission was presented. The Middle States Association of Colleges and Schools called the mission and goals of an institution the "basic characteristic of

⁴⁹²Evans, interview by author, 7; Phelps, interview by author.

excellence."⁴⁹³ Henry Spille, vice president of the American Council on Education said, "[the accreditation process] gives them [the National War College] a good indication of how well they are carrying out their mission, because the whole accreditation process, you know, is based on their mission."⁴⁹⁴ Therefore, it is vitally important for institutions that choose to participate in the accreditation process to ask questions about themselves in terms of their mission and purpose.

In addition to the validation of how well an institution carries out its mission by comparing the accreditation standards to the self-study and site visit, federal degree-seeking institutions are also visited by the Department of Education which also serves to validate how well an institution meets the accreditation standards.⁴⁹⁵

At the National War College, the process of accreditation was initiated by Vice Admiral J. A.

⁴⁹³Middle States Association of Colleges and Schools, Characteristics of Excellence in Higher Education, 9.

⁴⁹⁴Spille, interview by author.

⁴⁹⁵This process is comparable to the process that states go through in their process of authorizing degree-granting authority, however, the process among states is not standard and the Department of Education tries to use an optimum process of what the federal government considers the best method of validation.

Baldwin, president of National Defense University.⁴⁹⁶ According to Admiral Baldwin, there were two purposes for seeking accreditation. Those were conducting the self-study, which gave structure to looking at what the National War College was doing, and the site visit to ensure they met standards that were typical of the academic community.⁴⁹⁷

The consensus of faculty, administrators, and those outside of the National War College placed considerable value on the self-study, the site visit conducted by the Department of Education, and the potential site visit by the Middle States Association as "a way to learn about ourselves and sharpen our focus."⁴⁹⁸ The process has identified strengths and areas for improvement.⁴⁹⁹ Most importantly, it "caused [the National War College] to

⁴⁹⁶Baldwin, interview by author, 1-2. Admiral Baldwin was also the president of the Naval War College when he initiated the accreditation process at that institution which, as previously mentioned, received degree-granting authority and accreditation.

⁴⁹⁷Ibid., 1-3.

⁴⁹⁸Colonel Clifford R. Kreiger, U.S. Air Force, Joint Chiefs of Staff Chair and faculty member, National War College, interview by author, 17 June 1992, Washington, DC, tape recording. See also interviews by Dixon, Evans, Godwin, Hughes, Mladineo, Phelps, Skelton, Spille, Stafford, Zeimer, and Williams.

⁴⁹⁹Godwin, interview by author; Hughes, interview by author; Kreiger, interview by author.

look at our policies, our procedures, our curriculum, look at all those sorts of things with a fresh look. As you have to come up and explain what it is you do and why to a group of folks that may know nothing about you, that causes you to really understand and fine-tune the reasons for your existence. So I think the process itself is useful."⁵⁰⁰

In fact, as the National War College examined its mission, it was concluded that fundamental changes were not needed because the college was doing what it should be doing.⁵⁰¹ However, the self-study helped to refocus on the purpose of the college and who is served measured in long-term benefits.⁵⁰²

Having the opportunity to examine whether the college was fulfilling its mission was not the only benefit of the self-study process. The college looked at ways in which it met standards typical of other colleges and universities.⁵⁰³ The president of National Defense

⁵⁰⁰Lieutenant Colonel John F. Lilley, U.S. Army, faculty member of National War College, interview by author, 15 June 1992, Washington, DC, tape recording.

⁵⁰¹Baldwin, interview by author, 2; Greenlee, interview by author.

⁵⁰²Stadler, interview by author, 1-2.

⁵⁰³Baldwin, interview by author, passim; National War College, "National War College Self-Appraisal," passim.

University was able to focus on the composition of the Board of Visitors, faculty on curriculum requirements, and the librarian was able to focus on implementing formal collection development procedures.⁵⁰⁴ However, an area which was raised within the academic community and by the research was academic freedom.⁵⁰⁵

Academic freedom policies are published in faculty and student handbooks. The National Defense University policy on academic freedom is that faculty and students are encouraged to engage in "a climate of academic freedom within the university that fosters and properly encourages thorough and lively academic debate and examination of national security issues."⁵⁰⁶

The conclusion of whether academic freedom was or was not existent is important to the accreditation of the institution. At the National War College it was

⁵⁰⁴Baldwin, interview by author, 2; Kreiger, interview by author; Sarah A. Mikel, university librarian for National Defense University, interview by author, 8 June 1992, Washington, DC, tape recording. Formal collection development procedures referred to closer ties of the library to curriculum resource requirements.

⁵⁰⁵Jaschik, "A College for the Next Generation of Military Leaders," A3; Phelps, interview by author; Skelton, interview by author, 8-10.

⁵⁰⁶National War College, "National War College Self-Appraisal," 58. This policy is required by the Joint Chiefs of Staff (governing body) and included in their Military Education Policy Document.

determined through the research that academic freedom is present at the National War College.⁵⁰⁷

Academic freedom was analyzed by examining the freedom of the faculty in the classroom and the freedom of free expression in publications. Clearly, the faculty is not constrained with regard to how they teach, what they teach, or to whom they teach.⁵⁰⁸ On research and publication by the faculty, no faculty writing was amended or denied publication in the past nine years.⁵⁰⁹ Nearly all the faculty interviewed found that the college policies on academic freedom were solid and examples were

⁵⁰⁷Ibid., 59; Stadler, interview by author, 11; Williams, interview by author, 14.

⁵⁰⁸Colonel William R. Drennen, U.S. Air Force, faculty member of the National War College, interview by author, 18 June 1992, Washington, DC, tape recording; Colonel John S. Kelsey, U.S. Army, chair of the department of military strategy and operations and faculty member of the National War College, interview by author, 15 June 1992, Washington, DC, tape recording; Kreiger, interview by author; Captain Steven V. Mladineo, U.S. Navy, deputy chair of the department of national security strategy and faculty member of the National War College, interview by author, 15 June 1992, Washington, DC, interview by author; Smith, interview by author; Stafford, interview by author. It is noted that in the core courses, the course director is responsible for providing the course pak to the instructors but the faculty has full latitude to teach it in any manner he or she chooses.

⁵⁰⁹Stafford; interview by author. Also, Hughes, interview by author, reinforced that point who is has also been the director of research and writing since 1988.

given of faculty publication that was critical of [presidential] administrative policy through articles, op-ed pieces, and prominent newspapers; and in some cases testimony opposing political appointees.⁵¹⁰ The commandant of the college qualified the issue of academic freedom this way:

We don't [have a problem with academic freedom] now. I can't think of any issues in books, articles, journal articles, TV talk shows, or radio shows that have been inhibited by this being a government institution. I may not agree with everything that my faculty says but we've chosen to let the chips fall where they may.⁵¹¹

In addition to academic freedom, the college has also embraced a policy of nonattribution which is regarded by the college as a key element to the success of open discussion whereas guest lecturers, staff, faculty, and students can say whatever they think without the fear of hearing it repeated or quoted outside the classroom.⁵¹²

That is not to say that academic freedom in some of the staff's opinion does not exist in the same way that

⁵¹⁰Lilley, interview by author; Smith, interview by author.

⁵¹¹Stadler, interview by author, 11.

⁵¹²Godwin, interview by author; National War College, "National War College Self-Appraisal," 58.

it does in other environments.⁵¹³ But, the dean of faculty and academic programs concluded that evidenced by the numbers of civilian applicants for positions on the faculty from other colleges and universities, academic freedom is evident or those academicians would not leave their tenured positions, chairs, and deanships to come to the National War College.⁵¹⁴

In sum, a substantial benefit to the accreditation process has been renewal of the academic freedom policies of the college.

There are two additional benefits, identified by the research, from accreditation and the validation that the National War College conforms to established standards. The first is legitimacy within the community of higher education.

⁵¹³Godwin, interview by author; Skelton, interview by author, 8-9. Dr. Godwin made reference to self-censuring himself by using phrases such as "this is for academic discussion." Congressman Skelton commented that military leadership was generally not always open to free discussion and that academic freedom is a major aspect of a scholarly environment at professional military educational organizations, (Skelton, opening remarks at the 12 May 1992 hearing of the House Panel on Military Education). Colonel Hughes in an interview by author said that academic freedom is something that we need to jealously guard and referred to it as currency that if it is lost, then so is its credibility and that in that case, the National War College should not be accredited to award graduate degrees.

⁵¹⁴Stafford, interview by author.

The academic community relies on accreditation bodies to apply their standards equitably to member institutions. Therefore, a secondary benefit to accreditation of the National War College brings legitimacy within the higher education community.⁵¹⁵ That legitimacy brings prestige and public recognition to those who are associated with the college.⁵¹⁶ Faculty gain professional recognition and students earn a credible degree that is equivalent to similar programs at the graduate level.⁵¹⁷

The legitimacy of the National War College was not unanimously viewed as a benefit because it was opined that the National War College already enjoyed a high level of prestige in the higher education community.⁵¹⁸

⁵¹⁵Colonel Howard F. Bachman, U. S. Army, director of administration of the National Defense University, interview by author, 9 June 1992, Washington, DC, tape recording; Baldwin, interview by author, 4-5; Dixon, interview by author; Evans, interview by author, 6-7; Lilley, interview by author. Ms. Evans also used the correlation between the accreditation of the National War College and the Uniformed Services University of the Health Sciences which has regional and specialized accreditation and has earned legitimacy among its peers.

⁵¹⁶Evans, interview by author, 7; Hughes, interview by author; Spille, interview by author.

⁵¹⁷Baldwin, interview by author, 4; Greenlee, interview by author; Lilley, interview by author; Phelps, interview by author; Williams, interview by author; 6-7.

⁵¹⁸Greenlee, interview by author; Phelps, interview by author; Spille, interview by author.

The second benefit of applying accreditation standards to the National War College is competition in the marketplace: competition for faculty, competition in student recruiting, and equity among other institutions of professional military education. Faculty recruiting was not viewed as a problem in terms of attracting high quality military or civilian faculty evidenced by the credentials of the applicants from faculty searches.⁵¹⁹ However, because the National War College has to compete in the marketplace, accreditation levels the playing field for academicians who seek upward mobility and could help attract even more candidates for faculty positions.⁵²⁰

Viewed more important than the competition for faculty was the competition for students and the equity issue associated with the trend of accrediting other professional military educational institutions.⁵²¹ Since the trend of accrediting professional military education is on an upswing, the National War College

⁵¹⁹Kelsey, interview by author; Stafford, interview by author. Credentials included deans, department chairs, and well published individuals.

⁵²⁰Godwin, interview by author; Williams, interview by author, 7.

⁵²¹Hughes, interview by author; Smith, interview by author; Stafford, interview by author.

faculty wanted to be sure that they were competitive in that sense for students.⁵²² Although students do not apply to the college in the same manner that students apply to The College of William and Mary or other graduate programs, they can identify their preference as to which war college they attend. A secondary reason for identifying a choice of one college over another could be the award of a Master's degree over a diploma although the selection boards would probably not use that criteria in their selection decision.⁵²³

These issues of equity and competition in the marketplace are secondary benefits to the accreditation process, compounded with the accreditation of other war colleges, and the view that the National War College is the premier institution in the military community. Accreditation is the seal of approval in higher education that a college or university meets or exceeds specific standards that are applied across diverse organizations. Earning that seal forces an institution to examine itself, be examined by a team of academicians, and earn a legitimate place among other institutions. Accreditation

⁵²²Kelsey, interview by author; Kreiger, interview by author; Smith, interview by author.

⁵²³Dixon, interview by author; Kelsey, interview by author; Williams, interview by author, 11-12.

for the National War College is no different.

Stimulation of Continuous Improvement. The search for continuous improvement has been a crucial part of accreditation in the past and continues to be a part of the accreditation process in the present. The focus on continuous improvement is more than just a part of accreditation but is also a key focus of the quality revolution sweeping the United States and finding its niche in both higher education and federal organizations.⁵²⁴ Blending continuous improvement in both TQM and accreditation will certainly foster better organizations for the 21st Century.

An outcome of the self-study and site visit is renewal of the commitment to continuous improvement. In turn, continuous improvement is the foundation for maintaining standards. Those going through the accreditation process recognize that important aspect. Continuous improvement is immediately seen through the recommendations and action that result from the self-study.⁵²⁵ Specific examples at the National War College

⁵²⁴Ted J. Marchese, "TQM reaches the academy," American Association for Higher Education Bulletin, 44 (November 1991), 3-9.

⁵²⁵Hughes, interview by author; Godwin, interview by author.

include the formal establishment of the college policy regarding sabbatical leave for research by faculty (both military and civilian)⁵²⁶ and a review of honoraria for the faculty.⁵²⁷

A second venue for continuous improvement is gained indirectly during the visits by various academics to the campus. The site team can be equated to a group of high powered consultants who interact with the faculty and administration.⁵²⁸ The commandant of the National War College substantiated that assessment by saying he "asks them [the site team members] as many questions as they ask me"⁵²⁹ to gain the benefit of their observation and experiences from other institutions. That collegial focus among the institution leadership and the site team members extends to the strength gained by interacting among the other institutions in the regional association where the federal program or institution is located.⁵³⁰

The focus on continuous improvement is a long-term

⁵²⁶Godwin, interview by author; Hughes, interview by author; Stafford, interview by author.

⁵²⁷Hughes, interview by author. Other examples were identified in the discussion of the benefits of the self-study and site visit.

⁵²⁸Phelps, interview by author.

⁵²⁹Stadler, interview by author, 4-5.

⁵³⁰Pappas, interview by author, 24-25.

benefit of the accreditation process with respect to making a judgment on whether the mission of the school is satisfied by adequate resource allocation and a comprehensive curriculum.⁵³¹ The president of the National Defense University, Admiral J. A. Baldwin made this observation when asked about changes that might be attributed to accreditation in ten years:

I think fundamentally, that if you came back ten years from now, and if accreditation was successful, you would recognize the place. In other words, you would recognize the process. You would recognize the way the curriculum flows and the only changes that I would see in terms of mission, in terms of what we do, would be marginal changes, peaking on the margins to improve it. We are not the holders of all wisdom on how to educate people and I think that there may be something down-stream [that] we pick up in the accreditation process that will help us educate a little more broadly. There may be some insights that we gain from that process that will enable us to do something better. Just the fact that we are in contact with that element of the educational community, so that we can feed and integrate ideas back and forth, is just a useful thing to have.⁵³²

Protection Against Deleterious Forces. Selden and Porter identified this third function of accreditation but indicated that it was an infrequent benefit of the accreditation process. Nevertheless, accreditation

⁵³¹Evans, interview by author, 4-8; Greenlee, interview by author; Stafford, interview by author.

⁵³²Baldwin, interview by author, 10-11.

agencies were credited with effectively deterring forces that interfere with the educational process.⁵³³ In the course of the research, the accreditation process may help to protect the National War College against two deleterious forces.

The first area is resource allocation. In an interview with the National Defense University director of administration, Colonel Howard Bachman, the National War College is unlike private or state-funded institutions inasmuch as the federal government funds the operations and expenses for students to attend the college.⁵³⁴ There may be a need for resources in the future that may be easier to get using the leverage to meet an accreditation requirement.⁵³⁵

In addition to resource allocation, the Department of Education's subcommittee of the National Advisory Committee which visited the campus reported:

It is essential for the National Defense University to join the community of academic

⁵³³Selden and Porter, Accreditation: Its Purposes and Uses, 17-18.

⁵³⁴Bachman, interview by author. Colonel Bachman is also the National Defense University chief of staff to the president of the university. Colonel Bachman added the university benefitted from research grants and foundation funds for faculty chairs and other university requirements.

⁵³⁵Ibid.

institutions in order to safeguard its outstanding curricula and administration from the dangers of insularity, isolation and inbreeding. The normal processes of accreditation, review and membership activities associated with degree granting status, will provide the needed interaction with the greater academic community.⁵³⁶

That certainly is the greatest protection for the National War College associated with accreditation. Pappas added that insularity, isolation, and inbreeding are three areas that will and do choke every college and academic program in the United States⁵³⁷ if the administration and faculty do not guard against them. Pappas separated insularity from isolation by saying, "by isolated, you set up a curriculum and you think that curriculum works so well that you don't want to change that curriculum, opposed to insularity which is a built up mechanism to insulate you from the outside."⁵³⁸ The third area, inbreeding, is the use of inside resources in the institution.⁵³⁹ At National Defense University, Pappas found a solid program of recruiting outside people

⁵³⁶U.S. Department of Education, "Report of an On-site Visit."

⁵³⁷Pappas, interview by author, 18.

⁵³⁸Ibid. That mechanism can be by institutional type or geographic location among others. Mr. Pappas identified the periodic peer review in accreditation as the medium that protects against these dangers.

⁵³⁹Ibid., 18; Skelton, interview by author, 7-8.

to the faculty, thus guarding against inbreeding.⁵⁴⁰
The necessity to guard against inbreeding was also a concern of the Panel on Military Education.⁵⁴¹

Dissenting Factors Associated with Accreditation

The process of accreditation does not come without its criticisms and negative factors. From the leaders in the academic community to those moving through the process of accreditation, the accreditation process has both positive and negative attributes. Three specific issues were raised as areas of concern during the course of this case study at the National War College.

The first negative factor is the tangible and intangible cost to complete and maintain institutional accreditation. The cost is measured in terms of actual cash expenditures and in terms of time.⁵⁴² The accreditation process is generally financed through dues,

⁵⁴⁰Pappas, interview by author, 21; Hughes, interview by author. Colonel Hughes made reference to the college's record of using few, if any, immediate students to the faculty and the extensive faculty searches conducted by the college. Those accounts were also discussed and confirmed in interviews by the author with Colonel Stafford and Colonel Kelsey.

⁵⁴¹Skelton, interview by author, 7-8.

⁵⁴²Evans, interview by author, 8; Hughes, interview by author; Spille, interview by author; Brigadier General Michael J. Williams, U.S. Marine Corps, deputy director of Joint Staff for military education, interview by author, 11 August 1992, Washington, DC, transcript, 13.

fees, or contributions by member institutions.⁵⁴³ On the expenditure of time, however, although several man-years are used for the self-study and preparation of the site visit,⁵⁴⁴ the benefit or payback tends to outweigh the negative aspect⁵⁴⁵ of time because the benefits that are generally gained through the accreditation process tend to be "substantial, significant, and [reflect] positive change."⁵⁴⁶

A unique concern among a small group of those interviewed was the perception that accreditation standards would conflict with the method of delivering the curriculum. This concern is two-pronged. First, this minority was hesitant about the value of accreditation for the institution overall⁵⁴⁷ and the

⁵⁴³Evans, interview by author, 8.

⁵⁴⁴Hughes, interview by author; Phelps, interview by author; Spille, interview by author.

⁵⁴⁵Greenlee, interview by author.

⁵⁴⁶Spille, interview by author.

⁵⁴⁷Drennen, interview by author; Godwin, interview by author; Lewis, interview by author; Skelton, interview by author, 2. In Congressman Skelton's interview, he commented that when the Naval War College sought degree-granting authority he was hesitant, but the administration convinced him and the Panel on Military Education that it was reasonable to press onward. Further, he supported the accreditation of the National War College as well as institutions within the Air Force and Marine Corps.

award of a graduate degree.⁵⁴⁸ Those opposed to a degree for the curriculum favored the current award of a diploma.⁵⁴⁹ Apprehension was expressed that the process could cause a loss of control over the institution as a result of the many external groups "looking in" at the institution.⁵⁵⁰ There was also concern that the existing accreditation process would divert the focus of the curriculum toward satisfying an external group of site-visitors versus the requirements of national security.⁵⁵¹ In addition, requirements typical of

⁵⁴⁸Godwin, interview by author; Lewis, interview by author. Dr. Godwin added that the institution had gained much from the process itself through the self-study and site visit, however, his concern focused around his opinion that the National War College prepared officers for a host of different customers and a Master's degree should be more focused. Further, he expressed concern in general on the meaning of a Master's degree in the context of today's higher education enterprise.

⁵⁴⁹Godwin, interview by author; Lewis, interview by author. Mr. Hank Spille, in an interview by author, and other documentation by the American Council on Education has clearly awarded credit for the program at the National War College at the graduate level. Dr. Marianne Phelps at the Council on Postsecondary Accreditation added that a graduate degree would allow outsiders to view the program at the National War College in similar terms as other graduate programs rather than attempt to made correlations of the diploma in those circles. However, it is important for the purposes of highlighting the key areas of concern that the question of what a graduate program is in the United States be raised.

⁵⁵⁰Drennen, interview by author.

⁵⁵¹Ibid.

graduate programs at member institutions would become a part of the National War College and change the objectives of the current methodologies.⁵⁵²

Similar to the concern that the process could affect the curriculum was the third issue associated with the accreditation process at the National War College. Some expressed the potential that accreditation could have a negative effect on the mission of the institution in the future because of changes within the accreditation community that are at this time unforeseen.⁵⁵³ It is impossible to predict changes of accreditation, however, if such accreditation standards became a reality, they would be carefully weighed against the mission of the institution and the mission of the military and Joint Chiefs of Staff; and always side with the military

⁵⁵²Godwin, interview by author; Lewis, interview by author; Skelton, interview by author, 3-4. Colonel Lewis expressed concern that the grading system, mix of the faculty, and curriculum requirements would be affected by the accreditation process. Congressman Skelton shared concerns with the possibility of the imposition of "inappropriate" requirements to meet accreditation standards. It must be also noted that he also said that he believed the decision to allow the Naval War College to award degrees was the right decision and that he supports the award of graduate degrees at other institutions as well.

⁵⁵³Williams, interview by author, 13-14. Although several interviewees noted that the possibility of a conflict might exist in future revisions to the accreditation process, no one believed that was a reason for opposing accreditation.

mission.⁵⁵⁴ However, General Michael Williams on the Joint Staff recognized that the "communities of accreditation do not change radically, but rather tend to evolve slowly"⁵⁵⁵ making this concern not immediately tangible.⁵⁵⁶

Just as the higher education community has a limited understanding of military institutions, military institutions of higher education have a limited understanding of the accreditation community,⁵⁵⁷ both of which are increased through this research and the experience of the accreditation process at the National War College. Each of the opinions expressed as a concern

⁵⁵⁴Ibid., 13-14. In a related interview, Colonel Hughes saw the evolution of requirements that could change the essence or character of the program as a disadvantage. The author opines that the same considerations would be made with relationship to the mission of the college regardless of whether the institution is a federal or non-federal college or university.

⁵⁵⁵Ibid., 15; Hughes, interview by author. Colonel Hughes said, "we would have to examine those [potential requirements] very closely and if they come into core with what we are doing, and make requirements on us that are unacceptable, [accreditation would not be pursued]. In support of these observations, Ms. Patricia Evans, in her interview with the author also made reference to the relatively slow, methodical process that accreditation agencies tend to follow when changing or moving toward improving accreditation standards or criteria.

⁵⁵⁶See also footnote #553.

⁵⁵⁷Stadler, interview by author, 7; Williams, interview by author, 6.

to the accreditation process needs to be fleshed out in order to maximize the benefits of the accreditation process on an institution. However, our evolved accreditation process has increasingly focused on an institution's mission and the fulfillment of that mission.

In sum, while each of these concerns are real, the potential for the accreditation process to negatively impact the National War College in ways the faculty or administration perceive unwarranted change coming to fruition as a result of the accreditation process as we know it is nearly nonexistent.

CHAPTER 6

CONCLUSIONS

The process of accreditation is the venue used by the higher education community to maintain a minimum standard of quality and foster continuous improvement among colleges and universities. Over time, the process itself has also improved since the initial accreditation measurements were developed. Quantitative standards have been modified focusing on the mission of the institution and how the institution executes that mission.

The purpose of this research project was to examine the purposes of accreditation to determine how it would affect a unique institution, the National War College, in the community of higher education. First, the profession of arms fits Alexander Flexner's classic model by showing that the profession of arms was intellectual, learned, practical, had a communicable technique, emulated self-organization, and that altruism was a motivating force within the profession. Embracing the model of a profession and therefore the need for a professional school, the hypothesis that 'if the National War College fits the model of a professional school and is accredited as an institution of higher education, then its benefits

from the accreditation process will provide for an enhanced program as well as a professional status among peer institutions' was confirmed.

The hypothesis was confirmed by showing that the National War College is a professional school by comparing the traits of Alexander Flexner's model for a profession with the profession of arms. The National War College has volunteered to seek accreditation and William Selden and Harry Porter's paradigm of what purposes are served by accreditation validates the benefits for an enhanced program at the National War College are evident by volunteering to seek accreditation. It was found that the accreditation process ensures institutions meet minimum standards that are consistent among colleges and universities. Further, continuous improvement is the agent for maintaining rigorous standards and fostering change for the future and accreditation helps to protect institutions against deleterious forces. Finally, successful accreditation of the National War College will enhance its professional status within the higher education community.

In addition to the general hypothesis, subordinate research questions were considered. It was concluded that there is a niche or need for these types of institutions among other more traditional institutions of

higher education and that indeed, the community of higher education has the flexibility to include such diverse organizations.

Another area that was examined was the best type of accreditation for the National War College. Although the college curriculum is highly specialized, regional accreditation is the most appropriate method of recognition primarily because the credibility of a specialized accreditation agency would be suspect.

Implications of the Study

This study has broad implications within higher education. First, the study documents literature that informs the higher education community on professional military education, an area which needed elaboration according to Ernest Lynton and Sandra Elman. Further, the study indicated that the higher education process of accreditation has the necessary flexibility to encompass diverse institutions, a goal embraced by higher education.

Another benefit of the research is an update to Alexander Flexner's model for a profession validating it remains a classic, relevant paper.

The most far-reaching implication of the research, however, is documentation of the validity of the

traditional accreditation process for federal degree-granting institutions. Beyond the few institutions that are currently accredited, there are others similar to the National War College that seek accreditation and legitimacy among their academic peers. It is important for higher educational organizations and academicians to view these institutions as legitimate, credible institutions serving a vital niche in the higher education community.

Congressman Ike Skelton said that "we won't know if this [accreditation] is a good thing or not until we win the next three or four wars. When we look to see who won, if they were graduates of these accredited institutions."⁵⁵⁸ Of course, the military's success on the battlefield cannot be measured only in terms of the education received at professional military educational institutions, but it has been identified as a contributing factor since World War II.

Areas for Further Study

In The Chronicle of Higher Education,⁵⁵⁹ tenure was depicted by the author of the article as an issue at the

⁵⁵⁸Skelton, interview by author, 12.

⁵⁵⁹Jaschik, "A College for the Next Generation of Military Leaders," A3.

National War College. However, tenure should not be linked to the issue of accreditation and is an area for additional study. The research revealed that the mood for tenure at the National War College was mixed, however, General Stadler's comment, "I think that they [higher education leaders] have a good idea, but I think that we have a better one"⁵⁶⁰ urges further examination of alternative tenure models, like renewable multi-year term contracts, not only at the National War College but throughout academia.

A second area for further study is consistency for assessment of professional military education. The measurements suggested or discussed in the research ranged from promotion and elevation to the most senior levels of government to success in times of conflict or war to opinions that assessment is not measurable.⁵⁶¹

⁵⁶⁰Stadler, interview by author, 13. General Stadler along with others noted that the reasons for not having tenure was because of the need for faculty with current experience in the field. Although many interviewed took both sides, those who supported tenure could not recall any faculty member who wanted to stay that was eligible for contract renewal who was refused. Further, it was argued that among the civil service employees and military faculty members, both of those personnel systems make tenure a mute point.

⁵⁶¹Congress, House, Committee on Armed Services, Professional Military Education: Hearings before the Panel on Military Education, 1059. Referenced material was excerpted from statements by Congressman Skelton and the testimony of Lieutenant General Bradley C. Hosmer,

In sum, the National War College accreditation process should be complete in the near future. That accreditation will be lauded by some and criticized by others; but the students, public, and national security will be well served by an improved institution into the 21st Century.

U.S. Air Force (retired), former president of National Defense University who testified before the Panel on 24 May 1988; Lewis, interview by author; Phelps, interview by author; Skelton, interview by author, passim.

PRIMARY SOURCES

Published Works

- Ball, Harry P. 1983. Of responsible command: A history of the U.S. Army War College. Carlisle Barracks, PA: The Alumni Association of the United States Army War College.
- Bogdan, Robert C. and Sari K. Bilken. 1992. Qualitative research for education. Needham Heights, MA: Allyn and Bacon.
- Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. 1982. The control of the campus: A report on the governance of higher education. Lawrenceville, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Chambers, Charles M. 1983. Federal government and accreditation. In Understanding accreditation, eds. Kenneth E. Young, Charles M. Chambers, H. R. Kells, and associates, 233-269. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Cheit, Earl F. 1975. The useful arts and the liberal tradition. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company.
- Cohen, Michael D. and James G. March. 1988. Leadership in an organized anarchy. In ASHE reader on organization and governance in higher education, ed. Marvin W. Peterson. Needham Heights, MA: Ginn Press.
- Davis, Franklin M. Jr. 1976. The dilemma of the senior service colleges: A commentary. In The system for educating military officers, ed. Lawrence J. Korb, 107-115. Pittsburgh, PA: International Studies Association.
- Davis, Richard L. and Frank P. Donnini. 1991. Professional military education for Air Force officers: Comments and criticisms. Maxwell AFB, AL: Air University Press.

- Flexner, Alexander. 1915. Is social work a profession? In Proceedings of the National Conference of Charities and Correction at the forty second annual session, 576-590. Chicago: The Hildmann Printing Co.
- Glidden, Robert. 1983. Specialized accreditation. In Understanding accreditation, eds. Kenneth E. Young, Charles M. Chambers, H. R. Kells, and associates, 187-210. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Harcleroad, Fred F. 1983. Accreditation: Voluntary enterprise. In Understanding accreditation, eds. Kenneth E. Young, Charles M. Chambers, H. R. Kells, and associates, 36-53. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Hartman, Frederick H. 1976. The war colleges in perspective. In The system for educating military officers, ed. Lawrence J. Korb, 129-132. Pittsburgh, PA: International Studies Association.
- Hattendorf, John B., B. Mitchell Simpson III, and John R. Wadleigh. 1984. Sailors and scholars: A centennial history of the United States Naval War College. Newport, RI: Naval War College Press.
- Johnson, Vernon E. 1982. Development of the National War College and peer institutions. Ed.D. diss., The College of William and Mary in Virginia.
- Kandel, I. L. 1936. Examinations and their substitutes. In Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching Bulletin, 28, 34-35. Boston: The Merrymount Press.
- Katz, D. Mark. 1991. Witness to an era: The life and photographs of Alexander Gardner. New York: Penguin Group.
- Kerr, Clark. 1982. The uses of the university. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1963; reprint, 1982 (references are to reprint edition).
- Korb, Lawrence J. 1976. The System for Educating Military Officers. Pittsburgh: International Studies Association.
- Lynton, Ernest A. and Sandra E. Elman. 1987. New priorities for the university. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

- Masland, John W. and Laurence I. Radway. 1957. Soldiers and scholars: Military education and national policy. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Mayhew, Lewis B., Patrick J. Ford, and Dean L. Hubbard. 1990. The quest for quality: The challenge for undergraduate education in the 1990s. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Merriam, Sharan B. 1988. Case study research in education: A qualitative approach. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Pappas, George S. 1967. Prudens futuri: The US Army War College, 1901-1967. Carlisle Barracks, PA: The Alumni Association of the US Army War College.
- Reed, Alfred Z. 1937. Professional recognition, accountability, and licensure. In Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching thirty-second annual report, 41-63. Boston: The Merrymount Press.
- _____. 1938. Origins of licensing in the learned profession. In Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching thirty-third annual report, 76. Boston: The Merrymount Press.
- _____. 1939. Accrediting agencies. In Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching thirty-fourth annual report, 29-44. Boston: The Merrymount Press.
- Rudolph, Frederick. 1990. The American college and university: A history. New York: A. Knopf, 1962; Athens, GA: University of Georgia Press (page references are to reprint edition).
- Selden, William K. 1960. Accreditation: A struggle over standards in higher education. New York: Harper & Brothers.
- Selden, William K. and Harry V. Porter. 1977. Accreditation: Its purposes and uses. Washington, DC: Council on Postsecondary Accreditation.
- Shelburne, James C. and Kenneth J. Groves. 1965. Education in the Armed Forces. New York: Center for Applied Research in Education.

- Short, Lawrence O. 1985. Air University in war: The role of education in wartime. Maxwell AFB, AL: Air University Press.
- U. S. News and World Report. 1983. 1984 world almanac and book of facts. New York: Newspaper Enterprise Association.
- U. S. Congress. House. Committee on Armed Services, Panel on Military Education. 1989. Report of the Panel on Military Education. Report prepared by Ike Skelton. 101st Cong., 1st sess. Committee Print 4.
- _____. House. Committee on Armed Services. 1990. Professional military education: Hearings before the Panel on Military Education. 100th Cong., 1st and 2nd sess. H.A.S.C. No. 100-125.
- U.S. Joint Chiefs of Staff. 1991. Joint warfare of the U.S. Armed Forces. Washington, DC: National Defense University Press.
- van Creveld, Martin. 1990. The training of officers: From military professionalism to irrelevance. New York: The Free Press.
- Veysey, Laurence R. 1965. The emergence of the American university. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Young, Kenneth E. 1983. Accreditation: Complex evaluative tool. In Understanding accreditation, eds. Kenneth E. Young, Charles M. Chambers, H. R. Kells, and associates, 19-35. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Young, Kenneth E., Charles M. Chambers, H. R. Kells, and associates, eds. Understanding accreditation. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Journals and Publications

- Astin, Alexander W., H. R. Bowen, and Charles M. Chambers. 1979. Evaluating educational quality: A conference summary. Washington, DC: Council on Postsecondary Accreditation.
- Brumbaugh, A. J. 1950. The accrediting agencies face their common problems. The Educational Record, 31 (January): 59-92.
- Campbell, R. R. 1968. Progress and problems in the war colleges. United States Naval Institute Proceedings, 94 (September): 52-59.
- Cherney, Gloria. 1989. Accreditation and the role of the Council on Postsecondary Accreditation. Washington, DC: Council on Postsecondary Accreditation.
- Council on Postsecondary Accreditation. 1986. Educational quality and accreditation: A call for diversity, continuity, and innovation. Accreditation, 11: 1-5.
- _____. 1990. The COPA handbook. Washington, DC: Council on Postsecondary Accreditation.
- _____. 1991. Directory of recognized accrediting bodies. Washington, DC: Council on Postsecondary Accreditation.
- Crosson, Frederick J. 1987. The philosophy of accreditation. Washington, DC: Council on Postsecondary Accreditation.
- _____. 1988. The role of faculty in accreditation, Academe (July-August): 19-22.
- Dinham, Sarah M. and Linda M. Evans. 1991. Assessment and accreditation in professional schools. The Review of Higher Education 14 (Winter): 217-237.
- Evans, Patricia P. 1991. Conflict of interest: An Overview. In Marjorie P. Lenn, ed., Conflicts of interest and the accreditation process, 7-9. Washington, DC: Council on Postsecondary Accreditation.

- Evans, Patricia P. 1991. Conflict of interest: Policies and practices in the accreditation community. In Marjorie P. Lenn, ed., Conflicts of interest and the accreditation process, 25-44. Washington, DC: Council on Postsecondary Accreditation.
- Finkin, M. W. 1978. Federal reliance on educational accreditation. Washington, DC: Council on Postsecondary Accreditation.
- George, Melvin D. and Larry A. Braskamp. 1978. Universities, accountability, and the uncertainty principle. Educational Record 59 (Fall): 345-366.
- Hagerty, B. M. K. and Joan S. Stark. 1989. Comparing educational accreditation standards in selected professional fields. Journal of Higher Education, 60 (January-February): 1-19.
- Hessler, William H. 1956. The National War College - A civilian appraisal. United States Naval Institute Proceedings 82 (March): 272-277.
- Huffman, James. 1982. The role of accreditation in preserving educational integrity. Educational Record 63 (Summer): 41-44.
- Jaschik, Scott. 1991. A college for the next generation of military leaders. The Chronicle of Higher Education, 13 March, A3.
- Jung, Steven M. 1986. The role of accreditation in directly improving educational quality. Washington, DC: Council on Postsecondary Accreditation.
- Katzenbach, E. L. Jr. 1965. The demotion of professionalism at the war colleges. U.S. Naval Institute Proceedings 91 (March): 34-41.
- Kells, H. R. 1979. The people of institutional accreditation: A study of the characteristics of educational teams and related aspects of the accreditation process. Journal of Higher Education 50 (March-April): 178-198.
- Kilpatrick, Carroll. 1955. Tomorrow's leaders learn their trade. Nation's Business, April, 28.

- Kirkwood, Robert. 1978. Institutional responsibilities in accreditation. Educational Record 59 (Fall): 297-304.
- Kitfield, James. 1991. Schooled in warfare. Government Executive, October, 22-26.
- Lenn, Marjorie P. 1991. Conflicts of interest and the accreditation process. Washington, DC: Council on Postsecondary Accreditation.
- Marchese, Ted J. 1991. Regional accreditation. Change, May-June, 4.
- _____. 1991. TQM reaches the academy. American Association for Higher Education Bulletin, 44 (November): 3-9.
- McVey, William E. 1946. Developing accreditation standards. Phi Delta Kappan 27 (May): 253-256.
- Middle States Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools. 1991. Characteristics of excellence in higher education: Standards for accreditation. Philadelphia: Middle States Association of Colleges and Schools.
- Millard, R. M. 1983. The accrediting association: Ensuring the quality of programs and institutions. Change, May-June, 32-36.
- Millard, R. M., J. K. Folger, and J. D. Millett. 1987. Institutional mission, quality, and accreditation. In Higher Education Bibliography Yearbook 1987, 101, ed. K. Halstead. Washington, DC: Research Associates of Washington.
- Miller, Jerry W. and L. E. Boswell. 1979. Accreditation, assessment, and the credentialling of educational accomplishment. The Journal of Higher Education, 50 (March-April): 219-225.
- "[The] National War College." 1948. Richmond News Leader, 16 March, 12.
- Petersen, D. G. 1978. Accrediting standards and guidelines: A profile. Educational Record 59: 305-313.

Reeves, Floyd. W. 1931. Educational discussion. American Association of University Professors Bulletin 17: 522-531.

Selden, William K. 1956. Accrediting--What is it? American Association of University Professors Bulletin 42 (December): 629-635.

Thrash, Patricia A. 1979. Accreditation: A perspective. Journal of Higher Education 50 (March-April): 116-120.

_____. 1988. Educational "outcomes" in the accrediting process. Academe (July-August): 16-18.

Zoffer, H. J. 1987. Accreditation bends before the winds of change. Educational Record 68 (Winter): 43-46.

Other Documents

- Air University. 1990. Air War College Bulletin, 1990-1991. Maxwell AFB, AL: Air University.
- American Council on Education. n.d. The National War College 1973-1974 institutional report for the evaluation of the college. Washington, DC: American Council on Education.
- Bauskett, Frank N. 1907(?). The war college at Washington. Special Collections, Vertical File: NWC Building Drawings-Background, National Defense University Library, Washington, DC.
- Carman, G. N. 1902. "Report of the Commission of Accreditation Schools. In Addresses and proceedings of the National Educational Association, Minneapolis, Minn, 500-505. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Council on Postsecondary Accreditation. 1980. Policy statement on accreditation and the public interest. Washington, DC: Council on Postsecondary Accreditation.
- _____. 1982. The role and value of accreditation. Washington, DC: Council on Postsecondary Accreditation.
- _____. 1985. Report of the COPA committee on assessing the validity and reliability of accrediting body standards and process. Washington, DC: Council on Postsecondary Accreditation.
- Council on Postsecondary Accreditation and Council on Graduate Schools in the United States. 1991. Accreditation of graduate education: A joint policy statement. Washington, DC: Council on Postsecondary Accreditation.
- Craig, H[oward] A. 1954. Letter to the Joint Chiefs of Staff. Subject: Authorization for granting a Master's degree by the National War College, 20 July, carbon copy. Special Collections, National Defense University Library, Washington, DC.

- _____. 1955. Report by the commandant, the National War College, to the Board of Consultants, 21 April. Special Collections, National Defense University Library, Washington, DC.
- George Washington University and National War College. 1964. Bilateral supplement to the basic agreement between the George Washington University and the National War College, 3 July. Special Collections, National Defense University Library, Washington, DC.
- Keagle, James. [1989]. A summary of major activities and their evolution: Academic year 1946-1947 thru academic year 1989-1990. Special Collections, National Defense University Library, Washington, DC.
- Kells, H. R. and Richard M. Parrish. 1979. Multiple accreditation relationships of postsecondary institutions in the United States. Washington, DC: Council on Postsecondary Accreditation.
- Middle States Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools. [1955]. Information concerning the visit of the evaluation committee of the Middle States Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools. Special Collections, National Defense University Library, Washington, DC.
- _____. 1955. Evaluation report of the National War College, 16 March. Special Collections, National Defense University Library, Washington, DC.
- _____. 1991. Framework for outcomes assessment. Philadelphia: Middle States Association of Colleges and Schools.
- _____. [1991]. What is accreditation? Philadelphia: Middle States Association of Colleges and Schools.
- National Defense University. n.d. A chronological history from Turkey Buzzard Point to Fort Lesley J. McNair, Verticle File: Ft McNair-Chronology. Special Collections, National Defense University Library, Washington, DC.
- _____. n.d. Display Panel Titled: "Fort McNair 1965: The post as it was; the Lincoln conspirators; the executions," photos no. 7, 9, and 12. Special Collections, National Defense University Library, Washington, DC.

- _____. 1946? Verticle File: National War College curriculum-1946-47. Special Collections, National Defense University Library, Washington, DC.
- _____. [1946-1947]. Archival administrative memoranda, vol 1 and 2. Special Collections, National Defense University Library, Washington, DC.
- _____. 1977?. Verticle File: George Washington University. Special Collections, National Defense University Library, Washington, DC.
- _____. 1982. Memorandum to the Dean of Students and Administration, 8 March. Subject: NDU Charter/Mission Statement. Special Collections, National Defense University Library, Washington, DC.
- _____. 1986? Verticle File: NWC Graduates. Special Collections, National Defense University Library, Washington, DC.
- _____. 1989. Graduation exercises: Classes of 1989. Special Collections, National Defense University Library, Washington, DC.
- _____. 1990. Graduation exercises: Classes of 1990. Special Collections, National Defense University Library, Washington, DC.
- _____. [1991]. National Defense University 1991-1992 catalogue. Washington, DC: National Defense University Press.
- _____. [1992]. National Defense University 1992-1993 catalogue. Washington, DC: National Defense University Press.
- National War College. 1954. Data presented for consideration of the Commission of Institutions of Higher Education, 15 November. Special Collections, National Defense University Library, Washington, DC.
- _____. 1954? Fort Lesley J. McNair: Home of the National War College and the Industrial College of the Armed Forces, NWC Visual Aid 13,580,54,1000. Special Collections, National Defense University Library, Washington, DC.

- _____. 1955. The commandant's annual report: 1954-1955. Special Collections, National Defense University Library, Washington, DC.
- _____. 1955. Report of the Board of Consultants of the National War College: 1955, 22 April. Special Collections, National Defense University Library, Washington, DC.
- _____. 1966. The George Washington University Program in International Affairs, 1966-1967, 11 July. Special Collections, National Defense University Library, Washington, DC.
- _____. 1967. Report of a committee convened to review the organization of the National War College, June. Special Collections, National Defense University Library, Washington, DC.
- _____. 1974, June 24. Official ceremony commemorating the National War College building as a National historic landmark. Special Collections, National Defense University Library, Washington, DC.
- _____. 1990. Report of the NWC 1990 curriculum review committee. Special Collections, National Defense University Library, Washington, DC.
- _____. 1991. National War College self-appraisal. Courtesy of National War College, Washington, DC.
- _____. 1992. Student handbook: 1992-1993. Washington, DC: National War College.
- NWC Alumni Association. 1988. Directory of National War College graduates. Washington, DC: NWC Alumni Association.
- Naval War College. 1989. "Naval War College self study". Courtesy of National Defense University, Washington, DC.
- _____. [1991]. United States Naval War College catalog. Newport, RI: Naval War College Press.
- Norton, Leslie M. [1954]. The place and purpose of the National War College in the military educational system of the United States. Special Collections, National Defense University Library, Washington, DC.

- Roth, Margaret, ed. 1992. Handbook for military families: 1992 edition. Springfield, VA: Army Times Publishing Company.
- Skelton, Ike. 1992. Opening statement of Honorable Ike Skelton, Chairman, Military Education Panel before the Panel, 12 May. Washington, DC. Released by the office of Congressman Skelton.
- Stadler, Gerald P. [1989]. National War College 1995. Special Collections, National Defense University Library, Washington, DC.
- Strobridge, Truman R. [1988]. The Joint Chiefs of Staff and the joint education system: 1943-1986. Washington, DC: The Joint Chiefs of Staff.
- U.S. Chief of Naval Operations. 1947. Memorandum to the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Serial 188P30, 10 October. Subject: Directive for the National War College. Special Collections, National Defense University Library, Washington, DC.
- U.S. Department of Defense, Joint Secretariat. 1976. Note to the Joint Chiefs of Staff, JCS 2484/6-13, 8 April. [Subject]: Charter of the National War College. Special Collections, National Defense University Library, Washington, DC.
- U.S. Department of Education. 1992. Report of an on-site visit, a subcommittee of the National Advisory Committee, 22-24 March. Courtesy of executive director, National Advisory Committee, Washington, DC.
- U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. 1954. Federal policy governing the granting of academic degrees by federal agencies and institutions, 23 December. Courtesy of executive director, U.S. Department of Education, National Advisory Committee, Washington, DC.
- U.S. Joint Chiefs of Staff. 1947. Memorandum to the National War College Commandant, SM-9166, 6 November. Subject: Directive for the National War College, Special Collections, National Defense University Library, Washington, DC.

_____. 1955, January. Report to the Joint Chiefs of Staff of the National War College and the Industrial College of the Armed Forces Survey Board. Special Collections, National Defense University Library, Washington, DC.

_____. 1955. Memorandum to the National War College Commandant, SM488-55, 22 June. Subject: Report of the National War College and the Industrial College of the Armed Forces Survey Board. Special Collections, National Defense University Library, Washington, DC.

_____. 1956. Memorandum to the National War College Commandant, #SM-602-56, 18 July. Subject: Size and composition of the 1956-1957 National War College Class. Special Collections, National Defense University Library, Washington, DC.

_____. 1957. Memorandum the National War College Commandant, SM-670-57, 17 September. Subject: National War College annual report, 1956-1957. Special Collections, National Defense University Library, Washington, DC.

_____. 1990. Military education policy document. Washington, DC: U.S. Joint Chiefs of Staff.

U.S. General Accounting Office. 1992. Military education: Implementing of recommendations at the National War College, June. Washington, DC: U.S. General Accounting Office.

Interviews

- Bachman, Howard F., chief of staff and director of administration of National Defense University. 1992. Interview by author, 9 June, Washington, DC. Tape recording.
- Baldwin, J. A., president of National Defense University. 1992. Interview by author, 10 June, Washington, DC. Transcript.
- Cayton, Tommie, director of academic plans and policies of National Defense University. 1992. Interview by author, 9 June, Washington, DC. In Howard F. Bachman interview.
- Dixon, James V., faculty member of National War College. 1992. Interview by author, 15 June, Washington, DC. Tape recording.
- Drennen, William M. Jr., faculty member of National War College. 1992. Interview by author, 18 June, Washington, DC. Tape recording.
- Evans, Patricia P., vice chair of the Assembly of Specialized Accrediting Bodies of the Council on Postsecondary Education and executive director of the Council on Education for Public Health. 1992. Interview by author, 10 June, Washington, DC. Transcript.
- Gibert, Stephen P., director of the National Security Studies Program at Georgetown University and professor of government. 1992. Interview by author, 10 June 1992, Washington, DC. Tape recording.
- Godwin, Paul H. B., associate dean of faculty and academic programs of National War College. 1992. Interview by author, 15 June, Washington, DC. Tape recording.
- Greenlee, Joseph L. director of academic affairs of National Defense University. 1992. Interview by author, 11 June, Washington, DC. Tape recording.

- Hughes, Robert C., associate dean of faculty and academic programs of National War College. 1992. Interview by author, 15 June, Washington, DC. Tape recording.
- Kelsey, John S., chair, Department of Military Strategy and Operations of National War College. 1992. Interview by author, 15 June, Washington, DC. Tape recording.
- Krieger, Clifford R., JCS faculty chair of National War College. 1992. Interview by author, 17 June, Washington, DC. Tape recording.
- Lewis, L. Kirk, dean of students and executive officer of National War College. 1992. Interview by author, 17 June, Washington, DC. Tape recording.
- Lilley, John F., faculty member of National War College. 1992. Interview by author, 15 June, Washington, DC. Tape recording.
- Mikel, Sarah A., university librarian of National Defense University. 1992. Interview by author, 8 June, Washington, DC. Tape recording.
- Miller, B., staffer to Congressman Ike Skelton. 1992. Interview by author, 8 June, Rayburn House, Washington, DC. In Congressman Ike Skelton interview.
- Mladineo, Steven V., deputy chair of the Department of National Security Strategy of National War College. 1992. Interview by author, 15 June, Washington, DC. Tape recording.
- Pappas, Steven G., executive director of the National Advisory Committee on Accreditation and Institutional Eligibility of U.S. Department of Education. 1992. Interview by author, 10 June, Washington, DC. Transcript.
- Phelps, Marianne R., senior associate of Council on Postsecondary Accreditation. 1992. Interview by author, 11 June, Washington, DC. Tape recording.
- Skelton, Ike, U.S. Congressman of Missouri, 4th district, and chair, Panel on Military Education of the House Armed Services Committee. 1992. Interview by author, 8 June 1992, Rayburn House, Washington, DC. Transcript.

- Smith, Alan B., faculty member of National War College. 1992. Interview by author, 15 June, Washington, DC. Tape recording.
- Spille, Henry A., vice president of American Council on Education. 1992. Interview by author, 10 June, Washington, DC. Tape recording.
- Stadler, Gerald P., commandant of National War College. 1992. Interview by author, 18 June, Washington, DC. Transcript.
- Stafford, Roy W., dean of faculty of National War College. 1992. Interview by author, 15 June, Washington, DC. Tape recording.
- Williams, Michael J., deputy director of Joint Staff for military education. 1992. Interview by author, 5 August, The Pentagon, Washington, DC. Transcript.
- Zeimer, Dale E., faculty member of National War College. 1992. Interview by author, 15 June, Washington, DC. Tape recording.

VITA

Thom H. Terwilliger

Birthdate: May 7, 1958

Birthplace: Seoul, Republic of Korea

Education:

- 1990-1991 The College of William and Mary
Williamsburg, Virginia
Educational Specialist Degree
- 1991 Squadron Officer School at
Air University
Maxwell Air Force Base, Alabama
Diploma
- 1983 Golden Gate University
San Francisco, California
Master of Business Administration
- 1981-1983 Christopher Newport College
Newport News, Virginia
Bachelor of Science in Business
Administration
- 1977-1983 Community College of the Air Force
Maxwell Air Force Base, Alabama
Associate of Applied Science