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51st MEETING OF THE BOARD OF ADVISORS TO THE PRESIDENT, NAVAL POSTGRADUATE SCHOOL

Gunn, Lee F.
24 June 2009

From: Chair, Board of Advisors to the President, Naval Postgraduate School
To: Secretary of the Navy

Via: (1) President, Naval Postgraduate School
(2) Chief of Naval Operations

Subj: FIFTY-FIRST MEETING OF THE BOARD OF ADVISORS TO THE PRESIDENT, NAVAL POSTGRADUATE SCHOOL

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

Encl: (1) Board of Advisors Members and Other Meeting Attendees

1. In accordance with references (a) and (b), the Naval Postgraduate School (NPS) Board of Advisors (BOA) met on April 28 and 29, 2009 at the Naval Postgraduate School, Monterey, California. A list of members and others in attendance is at Enclosure (1). In our report below we describe the principal themes of this meeting. In addition, we highlight areas that we believe deserve special attention or require action.

2. Please allow us to introduce ourselves, Mr. Secretary. We are the 19 members of your Board of Advisors to the President of the Naval Postgraduate School. We represent a variety of those who are stakeholders in the welfare of the Nation’s Premier Defense Research University and we serve at your pleasure. For the purposes of our service on the NPS Board we are “special federal employees” subject to federal conflict of interest and ethics guidelines, though we are not compensated. Our purpose is to meet periodically and discuss matters of importance to the university and the Services it serves, and to advise the President of NPS and you on those issues.

3. The Board of Advisors meets twice a year, in the fall in the Washington, DC area, and in the spring in Monterey, CA. In the fall we usually convene in the offices of the Chief of Naval Research, both to learn about advances over the previous six months at the university and to emphasize the connection between the university and the advanced programs of the Office of Naval Research.
Following each of our meetings we submit a report to you via the President of NPS and the Chief of Naval Operations. The report we send you today is written to capture the most important issues discussed by the Board during the April 2009 meeting at NPS in Monterey. These spring meetings are special to all of the members. We reconnect with the university and its physical plant, and we catch up on changes in the offerings by the faculty and the thrust of research they lead. Perhaps most importantly, we meet with and learn from the students and faculty; we review programs, see students at work, and sample the attitudes and morale of the people of the university. As has been the case in every visit to Monterey of members serving now on your Board, we came away from our April 2009 visit inspired by the faculty, the students, and the staff of this fine institution.

In the following paragraphs we will describe for you issues we consider to be among the most important at this point in our continuing work with the Naval Postgraduate School.

4. Accreditation of NPS occurs every 10 years and the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC) is at approximately the mid-point of this decade’s multi-year accreditation process now. In March the WASC team made their first official visit and conducted the Capacity and Preparatory Review (CPR). Several members of your NPS Board of Advisors participated in that visit with NPS President Dan Oliver and his senior leaders. The visit was very successful, with the WASC team judging that NPS was well positioned to proceed to the next stage. The next WASC visit will occur in 2010 and that is the session during which the team will conduct the Educational Effectiveness Review. The Board would like to emphasize the critical timing of the WASC accreditation process and its sensitivity to the Navy’s resource allocation priorities. We recommend strongly that the NPS budget be protected, especially during this intensive evaluation by WASC. It is vital that support for today’s impressive programs at NPS be sustained and that planned improvements not be disrupted unintentionally by reductions in the university’s budget.

At the outbrief of the March CPR the WASC team members mentioned several times that NPS may be the Nation’s best kept secret. We think so too. That statement is both a tribute to the quality and value of NPS on the one hand, and the description of an outreach problem on the other. We hope to help NPS and the Department of the Navy work on improving the general
appreciation for the importance and contributions of the Nation's Premier Defense Research University.

Here are some examples of strengths on which NPS should continue to build and actions that leaders at NPS and members of the Board of Advisors can take to enhance the reputation and awareness of the extraordinary value of NPS to the Nation and to the international community.

a) Three faculty members Dr. Alan Washburn, Dr. Gerald Brown, and Dr. Donald Gaver were awarded the highest professional distinction a U.S. engineer can achieve; they were elected to lifetime membership in the National Academy of Engineering. Each added accolade for the university enhances the reputation of the faculty, the value to graduates of their degrees, and the attractiveness of NPS as a partner to other research institutions.

b) We suggest, and members of the Board have volunteered to assist in, increasing nominations of faculty members for this recognition, for elections to the National Academy of Engineering—not only in Sections 8 (Systems, OR, IE), but also in Section 12 (specific fields and interdisciplinary studies) and the National Academy of Science. Additionally, nominations should be sought for the American Association for the Advancement of Science.

c) We recommend that NPS establish links with CESUN (Council of Engineering Systems Universities). With the growing connections between NPS and the national community of research universities, and in consideration of the growing potential for such collaboration, it will be increasingly important for NPS leaders to enhance their visibility within civilian higher education circles. The Board agreed that such opportunities should be explored. NPS Advisory Board member Dr. Graham Spanier, President of The Pennsylvania State University, agreed to take the lead in identifying such possibilities and making introductions as appropriate with the Association of Public and Land Grant Universities (AFLU), the American Council on Education (ACE), and other organizations. NPS President Oliver and Provost Len Ferrari were very open to making such connections.

5. The Board considered the continuing and fruitful relationship between the Naval Postgraduate School and the Air Force Institute of Technology (AFIT). AFIT and NPS enjoy an excellent relationship, each institution has a seat on the other's Board,
steps have been taken to eliminate redundancy in course offerings, lessons-learned are shared freely, and officers of the Naval Services and Air Force attend each other's institutions. A Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) provides the context for the operating relationship of NPS with AFIT. The NPS Board of Advisors monitors the relationship and discusses matters concerning the two schools periodically and will continue to do so as a regular feature of our meetings.

The following notes update the NPS Board of Advisors' thinking on the AFIT-NPS relationship and MOA as a result of discussions at this meeting. We recommend that:

a) The parties revisit the MOA of 2002 between the Secretary of the Air Force and the Secretary of the Navy. Given the expected pressures on the defense budget, even the appearance of duplication will make programs at the schools targets for reductions. Reviewing and updating the collection of academic programs at both institutions would be prudent. An MOA update, if necessary, can accompany and be based on such a review.

b) NPS and AFIT continue to cultivate the linkages, exchanges, and collaboration that have shown such good results for both institutions to this point. Faculty and staff contact, exchanges, teaming, and sharing of best practices are examples of these mutually beneficial opportunities we suggest both schools continue to exercise.

c) NPS and AFIT work to enhance further their cooperation in research, online education, and complimentary design of programs. We ask that NPS report to the Board of Advisors briefly on this item at the September meeting.

d) The Board include discussions of the AFIT-NPS relationship as a regular item in future agendas, as noted above.

e) Trends in enrollments at each school by USAF and USN/USMC officers be examined and, where balance is not being maintained, ensure that the reasons are understood.

6. We were glad to learn more at this meeting about the reenergized NPS Foundation. The Board is pleased to note the substantially expanded efforts by the Naval Postgraduate School Foundation in support of the School. Because of the Foundation's organizational and charter flexibility, we anticipate that the Foundation will support NPS in furthering its mission in ways that cannot otherwise be pursued by a federal government organization. Independent foundations, closely related to their college or university, have long served higher education in America (especially the state universities and colleges) in both
charitable and operating capacities. The NPS Foundation has recently begun a long term campaign to build its endowment. Though this effort is still in its early stages, the Board is impressed with both the progress and plans of the NPS Foundation.

We recommend that NPS leaders consider offering to host the Defense Orientation Conference Association (DOCA) at the school. This organization would, we believe, appreciate the opportunity to get to know NPS and would be likely to support the school through the Foundation in the process.

As we note in the paragraph below, the Board of Advisors is considering chartering a subcommittee to improve our understanding of the NPS Foundation’s operations and effects.

7. We believe that subcommittees, both permanent and ad hoc may be increasingly useful to the Board in fulfilling its duties. The BOA has functioned primarily to this point as a single body. Even so, there have been a few specific instances that prompted the establishment of short term subcommittees, in recognition of the necessity of efficient and effective board action within the board’s normal meeting cycle. The board will begin discussions at the fall meeting of the value of permanent subcommittees to facilitate the board’s discharge of its duties to the Secretary and the President of NPS. The board is considering, for example, the standing subcommittee alluded to above to address issues that may arise around the relationship and functioning of the NPS Foundation and the School. In another vein, an ad hoc committee on AFIT/NPS might serve the Board well as we address this relationship periodically.

8. Environment and energy are hot national security topics; we believe there is an important developmental role for NPS in understanding them. The Obama Administration has made clear that innovations in energy and environmental management will be high priorities. It will be worth an examination of the capabilities at NPS to determine where the university might contribute to what is likely to be an important and well-funded national security effort. We recommend that NPS undertake this review soon.

9. We continue to be very interested in the role of NPS in Education for the Intelligence and Cryptologic Officer Communities. The Naval Postgraduate School has had a rich historical role in contributing to the professionalism of officers in the Naval intelligence community. Specifically, the
Naval Security Group for many years sent many of its officers (1610, cryptologic officers) to NPS for advanced degrees (Program 590). The first doctoral degrees in Electrical Engineering awarded by NPS were to security group personnel. Further, the Director of Naval Intelligence established a technical intelligence MS level program (for 1620, intelligence officers) at NPS in the early seventies. Because of the pressing need for attaché officers in the US Air Force, Air Force candidates for those foreign assignments have attended NPS and the Defense Language School, Monterey, in a joint program. With the shift of emphasis by the Secretary of Defense to nontraditional warfare, a simultaneous change in professional intelligence education will be necessary. This new emphasis involves foreign language and foreign cultural awareness and training, along with education in innovative technology, its concepts and uses. NPS is uniquely qualified by both faculty and experience to inaugurate such tailored educational programs quickly for each of the services. The Board recommends this issue be raised with Secretary Gates to seek his views, insights and support.

10. It is important that the robust NPS International Student Program align with the OPNAV N3/N5 “effects based” approach to the larger issue of country engagement. We recommend that, at the next Advanced Education Review Board (AERB), NPS display its international student population in the context of RADM Lemmons’ (N52, Dir. for International Engagement, OPNAV) “bins,” and seek input for future shaping. Three other ideas concerning international students specifically warrant discussions at upcoming BOA meetings:

a) Consider periodic international student reunions to solidify relationships, update alumni on programs, exchange ideas with/among them, and increase NPS appeal internationally
b) Integrate international students at NPS further, with students of other services and U.S. agencies
c) Establish or broaden outreach mechanisms specifically for international alumni.

11. The Board appreciates the fine updates it receives on IT issues from NPS leaders, especially Dr. Christine Cermak, at our meetings. We benefitted from such a brief at our April meeting. We suggest these topics for upcoming BOA meetings, as appropriate:
a) The costs and tradeoffs associated with migration to a dot edu domain from the dot mil domain. While protecting and minimizing risks to our .mil network is paramount in today’s environment, multiple restrictions on the .mil domain hinder the educational and research core areas of our academic institutions. Some of these restrictions include system blocking of educational research sites, and blocking of streaming audio and video, blogs, discussion groups, and wikis. Blocked communications with other civilian educational institutions and certain countries can hinder an institution’s ability to research topics critical to the mission.

b) Lessons learned from implementation of dot edu at other military institutions, and best-practice governance structures to enhance IT planning, requirements development, acquisition, and resource allocation.

c) Advances in open architecture.

d) Governance structures.

e) Use of social media to establish and maintain the community of Naval Postgraduate School: faculty, students, staff, graduates.

12. The Board talked briefly about classified research spaces and asked for a brief at our September 2009 meeting on NPS SCIF capabilities and an assessment of needs and shortfalls, if any. NPS has a wide array of classified research projects being worked in a variety of departments and programs. The Board understands from our campus tour and conversations with students and faculty, that classified space is limited and that this limitation may be inhibiting some research. We are in a world where classification of work is becoming more prevalent and adequate classified space will be essential to ensuring NPS remains relevant to its customers.

13. Acquisition and acquisition education were the subject of some extensive discussions during our meeting. We had talked at earlier meetings with NPS faculty members about the acquisition curriculum at the university and had learned that USN officer students have largely been absent for years, although attendance by international students and officers of other U.S. armed services has helped fill the classes. At this April’s meeting we saw that Navy’s acquisition community makes little use of the program to this day. We are concerned that the Navy may continue to miss opportunities for early education of officers for the acquisition profession; members of the Board believe that is will be important to sew the seeds of improving the professionalism of the Navy’s acquisition community through use
of the masters program at NPS. This will be a discussion item for the Board during the fall 2009 meeting also.

14. We think that it is important to NPS that the effort to create a greater feeling of community among NPS alumni succeed. NPS continues working to build the community of faculty, students, staff, and graduates, where information is available with which to do so. We recommend that, to the extent permitted by privacy considerations, the Chief of Naval Personnel and other Navy leaders assist in this effort to identify and locate members of the NPS community. This effort could be especially helpful in improving the roster of NPS alumni.

15. Finally, Mister Secretary, the President, U.S. Naval Postgraduate School and the Chairman, Naval Postgraduate School Board of Advisors would like to call on you to introduce ourselves. We propose to present and discuss this report briefly. Beyond that, we suggest that the President be given an opportunity to summarize recent updates to the university’s strategy and we offer that the President and Chairman are available for additional discussions at your convenience. You may specifically want to discuss further the university and its place in developing educated and intellectually strong officers and in supporting the Department of the Navy’s technical requirements and strategy for international engagement. Also, the President and Chairman would like to invite you to participate in the fall meeting of the NPS Advisory Board, 9 and 10 September, 2009 in the Washington, DC area.

Very Respectfully,

[Signature]

LEE F. GUNN
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