

NOT FOR PUBLICATION
UNTIL RELEASED BY THE HOUSE
ARMED SERVICES COMMITTEE
SUBCOMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT
AND INVESTIGATIONS

STATEMENT OF
LtGen JOHN M. PAXTON, USMC
DIRECTOR of OPERATIONS, JOINT STAFF
(Acting For DIRECTOR, JOINT STAFF)
BEFORE THE
SUBCOMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND INVESTIGATIONS
OF THE
HOUSE ARMED SERVICES COMMITTEE
PROFESSIONAL MILITARY EDUCATION POLICY HEARING
28 JULY 2009

Statement of LtGen JOHN M. PAXTON, USMC
House Armed Services Committee
Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations
28 July, 2009

Mr. Chairman, Mr. Wittman, Members of the Subcommittee. Thank you for the opportunity to meet with you and discuss the Chairman's vision for Joint Officer Development, the significance of Joint Officer Management, and the importance of Joint Professional Military Education.

The Armed Forces of the United States comprise the Active and Reserve components of the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps and Coast Guard. Each service possesses its own unique traditions and competencies, which contribute to the versatility, flexibility and effectiveness of the joint force. Together we support and defend our Nation, its people, its friends, and its interests worldwide. In conjunction with other U.S. government agencies, we are engaged in strengthening and expanding relationships with international partners. These partnerships contribute to creating and maintaining a stable environment while concurrently deterring potential adversaries.

U.S. military power today is unsurpassed on the land and sea and in the air, space, and cyberspace. The individual Services have evolved capabilities and competencies to maximize effectiveness in these respective domains. Even more important, the ability to integrate our diverse capabilities into a joint whole that is greater than the sum of the Service and Agency parts is an undeniable American strategic advantage.

However, it is our people who ultimately are our greatest strength and advantage. We repose special trust and confidence in their patriotism, valor, fidelity and abilities. We recognize that these attributes are formed first by their families and communities, then honed by purposeful development while in Service. Our stewardship of these precious assets is both a sacred trust and a solemn responsibility.

The landmark 1986 Goldwater-Nichols Department of Defense Reorganization Act set the Department of Defense on the path which led to today's joint force and our approach to joint leader development. In 2005, Chairman Pace published his vision for Joint Officer Development to inform the Department's approach towards developing the leaders for our future joint force. Congress saw fit to support this Vision in legislation; the transition to a "Joint Qualified Officer" or JQO vice the previous Joint Specialty officer approach recognizes the broad application of the Jointness across the Armed Forces. Chairman Mullen actively

supports this vision and is a staunch believer that in order to succeed, the Armed Forces must fundamentally be a learning organization in both word and deed. As both Chief of Naval Operations and as Chairman, he has actively sought to ensure both the relevancy and efficacy of learning inside the Armed Forces. Inside the context of Joint Officer Development, our approach can be summed as “the right education, for the right officer, at the right time.”

Professional Military Education, both Service and Joint, is the critical element in officer development and is the foundation of a joint learning continuum that ensures our Armed Forces are intrinsically learning organizations. As joint leaders, we understand that young officers join and are largely trained and developed in their particular Service. Over time, they receive training and education in a joint context, gain experience, pursue self development, and over the breadth of their careers, become the senior leaders of our joint force. For efficiency, joint learning requirements are often embedded within Service-based learning. Our developmental efforts must ensure that officers are properly prepared for their leadership roles at every level of activity and employment, and through this, ensure that the US Armed forces remain capable of defeating today’s threat and tomorrow’s threat.

The United States enjoys an overwhelming qualitative advantage not only in our fielded capabilities, but in our cognitive approach to our duties. Sustaining and increasing this advantage requires a continual effort combining technology, intellect, and cultural changes across the joint community. We should not lose sight of the fact that the senior leaders of our Armed Forces of tomorrow will be developed, honed and identified within the construct of the PME/JPME system today. Our education system must therefore serve us by meeting the needs of today as well as the expectations of tomorrow.

Joint Professional Military Education (JPME) writ large enhances the total force capability and our capacity to effectively wage traditional and irregular warfare. The JPME system needs to continue to build an officer who understands the strategic implications of tactical actions and the consequences that strategic actions have on the tactical environment. Service delivery of PME, taught in a joint context, instills not only basic Service core competencies; but it enhances joint warfighting and leader competence. JPME and PME work together in effective harmony serving many needs but one goal.

In its fullest sense, education conveys a broad body of knowledge and develops the habits of study and of mind which are essential components of any military professional’s expertise in the art and the science of war. Our JPME system should therefore produce:

(1) Strategically minded officers educated in the profession of arms who possess an intuitive approach to joint warfighting built upon their individual Service competencies. Its' aim is to produce graduates prepared to lead future force envisioned by the Capstone Concept of Joint Operations (CCJO) within a multi-Service, multi-agency, multi-national environment and able to participate in and contribute to informed decision-making on the application of all instruments of national power.

(2) Critical thinkers who view military affairs in the broadest context and are capable of identifying and evaluating likely changes and associated responses affecting the employment of US military forces. JPME graduates should possess acuity of mind at the highest level; gained as a result of a continuum of learning across a lifetime.

(3) Senior officers who, as skilled joint warfighters, can develop and execute national military strategies that effectively employ the Armed Forces in concert with other instruments of national power to achieve the goals of national security strategy and policy.

The future joint force requires knowledgeable, empowered, innovative, and decisive leaders capable of succeeding in fluid and perhaps chaotic operating environments with more comprehensive knowledge of interagency and multinational cultures and capabilities.

I have given you to this point the conceptual framework which drives PME and JPME throughout the Department. Please allow me now to discuss a few particulars of interest in direct response to the issues raised in your invitation to participate in this hearing.

Policy Framework and Authorities

The Chairman is given specific responsibility in Title 10 for formulating policies coordinating the military education and training of members of the armed forces. The Chairman's guidance for the PME system is found in his "Officer PME Policy" or "OPMEP." This instruction is the foundational policy underpinning professional military education and provides for an approach that produces a cadre of officers versed in the topics and issues associated with the significant aspects of "Joint Matters". Additionally, the PME Learning continuum is structured to satisfy statutory educational requirements consistent with Joint qualifications and eligibility criteria for promotion to General and Flag Officer rank.

The Chairman executes his educational responsibility in harmony with the Service Chiefs. With advice and coordination, he broadly establishes the joint mission of each individual school or college particularly at the Intermediate and Senior Level of education. The Service Chiefs are able to

infuse the nature of their component (land force-Army, maritime force-Navy, Aerospace-Air Force, Expeditionary-Marine Corps) throughout the curricula in order to satisfy Service as well as Joint PME requirements.

Title 10 further structures a three-phase approach to JPME; JPME-I, JPME-II, and CAPSTONE. These phases of JPME shall be "designated and certified by the Secretary of Defense with the advice and assistance of the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff". The legislative changes dictated in the Ronald W. Reagan National Defense Authorization Act of 2005 have expanded the opportunities for senior officers to receive JPME-II. It reinforced the link between joint officer management and JPME.

Mission and role of the joint in-residence PME system

The gold standard of the PME system is the in-resident method of delivery. Opportunities for substantial professional education, especially JPME-II for senior officers, are relatively rare – particularly for the extended in-residence education that produces a synergy of learning that only comes from daily, face-to-face interaction with fellow students and faculty.

Humans seem to learn best in face-to-face settings; this is especially true when changes in attitude (or affective learning outcomes) are desired, as they are in our JPME approach. For this reason, we broadly understand that JPME delivery has three main components, as follows:

- 1) “What is taught” meaning a joint curriculum based on approved Joint Doctrine and Concepts;
- 2) “Who is taught” meaning a student body with all service participation in percentages to support affective joint learning; and
- 3) “Who teaches” meaning a military faculty with all service participation to support effective affected joint learning.

These three bullet summary points mirror the letter and spirit of legislation but also create a natural and potentially healthy tension with our desire to educate the largest total percentage of the officer corps. Additional space is also provided to DOD Civilians, amongst other populations. Congress has been very generous in its provision to the Department of the resources required to maintain our in-residence approach and has further supported our vibrant non-resident JPME I programs. This said, the restriction limiting JPME II programs to “in-residence” only creates a narrowing of opportunity to achieve this essential education. Practically, each year there are but 2,000 school seats spread across the 8 JPME II venues.

The JPME-II threshold could be enhanced by either increasing the resource requirements to build and populate larger school houses; or with legislative authority to deliver JPME-II by non-resident modes. The

hybrid—a mix of resident and non-resident delivery—approach contained in the Advanced JPME Course tailored for the Reserve Component (RC), offers an exemplar of a successful, seminar based, non-resident delivery program. The absence of joint acculturation among the student population is mitigated by the increased access to the joint learning content. In-residence education is preferred; however, the Department believes a non-resident approach to JPME-II may have future value. Accordingly, the National Defense University has conducted research into developing courses of action to support non-resident delivery options which satisfy Chairman Pace's guidance to ensure students still receive some opportunity to meet face-to-face. Accordingly, the only non-resident options considered as potentially viable are those which protect the primacy of in-resident education, and are seminar based.

System Performance

Broadly, our judgment is that the PME system is meeting its objectives. This is not, to say however, that improvements are not desired, nor possible. They are categorically both desired and possible. Our deeply committed educators are constantly striving to ensure their courses are relevant. They balance timeless requirements such as inculcating clear thinking and clear speech with topical issues of today. Students likewise have this expectation and many of them come directly from combat units and deployments of relevance, and use the academic year to reflect deeply on their experiences. Military Faculty frequently fit this paradigm as well; their experiences also enrich delivery.

Chairman Mullen is prone to ask "are we teaching the right things?" Most recently, this question resulted in a detailed review of the CAPSTONE Course. Following this review, the Chairman issued guidance to both the NDU-President and to the Service Chiefs to enhance the efficacy of the course. The Guidance included enhancing the bridge between JPME II level education, CAPSTONE education, and subsequent courses for Generals and Admirals; and improving the interagency dimension of the course.

Process and indicators of system performance

A time proven Service adage speaks to the fact that it is not what the Commander "expects" but what he "inspects" that ensures desired results. Young leaders throughout the Force are taught that "supervise" is the most important troop leading step. In this vein, the Chairman ensures positive results in JPME through the Process for the Accreditation of Joint Education, referred to as the PAJE. The PAJE, based on the accreditation approach of civilian academia, regularly validates that our Joint Education efforts achieve their objectives. These assessments are conducted routinely on a 6-year cycle (as opposed to civilian academia's

10-year cycle) and whenever substantive changes suggest reassessment. Mirroring the emphasis of legislation, periodic assessments of JPME are specifically conducted for the Phase I, II and CAPSTONE programs. A PAJE certification is thorough and rigorous. Joint accreditation is taken just as seriously if not more seriously by the individual institutions approach to Regional Accreditation of their Masters Degree Programs because JPME satisfies their primary mission. Joint acculturation and an understanding of the tenets of joint matters is the primary focus of Intermediate and Senior level education.

The CJCS' PAJE process serves three purposes: oversight, assessment and improvement. A balanced team of peers and experts work together to assure that each JPME College/School properly executes to standard, and to offer each institution the benefit of the team's findings and recommendations. The PAJE is fundamentally a peer review process which also serves to spread best practices amongst each JPME venue. Curricula content and development, faculty as well as student quality and composition, institutional organization and climate, resourcing, and library and research capabilities form the core for assessment and accreditation from the Chairman.

The Chairman seeks to maintain consistency across the various JPME venues through a regimen of Common Educational Standards. The standards are described in the CJCS OPMEP but are summarily as follows:

1. Develop Joint Awareness, Perspective, and Attitudes;
2. Employ predominantly active and highly effective instructional methods;
3. Assess student achievement;
4. Assess program effectiveness;
5. Conduct quality faculty recruitment, selection, assignment, and performance assessment;
6. Conduct faculty development programs for improving instructional skills and increasing subject matter mastery; and,
7. Provide institutional resources to support the educational process

The relevance of the curricula is bedrock to institutional value. Curricula improvement is actively pursued by the Director Joint Staff-led Military Education Coordination Council which provides Joint oversight to annual updates to curricula topics. This past year, Irregular Warfare, Cyberspace and Cyberspace Operations, Strategic Communication, Information Operations, Security Stability Transition and Reconstruction Operations, and Joint Logistics received additional coverage in either or both the CJCS' Officer PME Policy or his Annual "Special Emphasis" list.

Joint Officer Management

In the Joint Officer Development equation, JPME pairs with Joint Officer Management to produce Joint Qualified Officers (JQOs). Properly educated and experienced JQOs are essential to the department's and service's ability to successfully integrate joint capabilities. JQOs serve as the catalyst for developing and presenting timely, concise, and influential joint military advice in the following areas: operational and contingency planning at the national and strategic level, the employment of forces, roles and missions, the development of joint doctrine, joint policy, and the command and control of organizations and forces under unified command. In addition, JQOs serve a vital role in developing officers assigned to joint organizations for the first time to acclimate and perform their joint responsibilities. When JQOs return to their Service they can provide their unique joint perspective to their organizations.

- Selection of JPME students, faculty, and staff personnel

The selection of students and faculty, up to and including the senior staff of Commandants, Presidents, or Deans, is nominally a Service responsibility. Students at resident JPME I and II schools are generally selected by a Board within the Service. Military faculty is also selected by the Services but is generally subject to vetting by the school or academic institution. Military Faculty at JPME institutions must have certain credentials regarding their own educational qualifications and joint experiences; these are detailed in the CJCS' OPMEP. Chairman oversight is exercised through PAJE validation of appropriate size and composition of the student body student and military faculty. A JPME-II Memorandum of Agreement has been brokered between the Services to ensure the quantity and requisite skill sets within the faculty are in place to satisfy the individual school requirements. A similar MOA is under work for the JPME I schools and should be completed this year.

Regarding Senior Schoolhouse leadership, each selection is carefully weighed. Service Chiefs bear responsibility for the choices made at their schools. The Chairman selects the General/Flag Officer leadership for the NDU Schools and makes a recommendation to the Secretary of Defense regarding the officer to be the NDU President. NDU assignments rely on quality nominations from the Services.

- Future assignments of JPME students and faculty

Post faculty tour assignment or student placement following graduation is also a Service responsibility. Each assignment is a different combination of requirement, skills and individual preferences, but broadly speaking, graduates of resident JPME are prized across DOD and are so handled by the assignment staffs. The Services understand the importance of

managing joint assignments which affect not only future individual promotion eligibility; but most importantly, which ensure the right officers are assigned to support joint commands and staff missions at the right time. The Joint Staff J-1 monitors outplacement and reports annually to congress in order to validate compliance with legislative mandates for placement and promotion targets.

The Chairman has recently written to the Service Chiefs to solicit a greater focus on the early assignment of new Flag Officers to CAPSTONE; and a greater rate of outplacement of JAWS graduates directly in to joint assignments. A soon to be released revision to the Chairman's PME Policy will expect a 100% placement of JAWS graduates directly into a Joint assignment.

- JPME-I Faculty assignment and Joint Experience Credit

Joint duty credit is a faculty quality issue which encourages and facilitates the best and brightest operationally experienced officers to be naturally inclined to seek faculty duty. Currently, the law restricts all but JPME II instructors from inclusion on the Joint Duty Assignment List (JDAL). Although some instructor duties will possibly not provide significant experience in joint matters, there are many that will; and the law should not exclude these positions from consideration. The department should have the capability to evaluate the duties of each position against the statutory definition of "joint matters" and determine if the position meets the standard of providing the officer significant experience in joint matters. Although officers seek JDAL positions, the department does not add positions to the JDAL solely as an incentive for an officer to take an assignment. Joint Matters is a very high threshold and only those positions that meet or exceed the requirements outlined in statute are placed on the JDAL. The department's JDAL validation process will ensure that only the correct JPME faculty positions are included on the JDAL.

Conclusion

The men and women of our Armed Forces are our nation's most important and most cherished strategic resource. Only a force of dedicated, highly educated and well-trained men and women capable of leveraging new ideas will succeed in the complex and fast-paced environment of current and future military operations. Our Armed Forces must exhibit the highest standards of personal and institutional integrity, competence, physical courage and moral courage, as well as dedication to ideals and respect for human dignity. It is imperative that we collectively maintain a sustained emphasis on the highest ideals developed and espoused in our Joint education process. The Congress' continued support of our efforts are viewed as vital and are enormously appreciated.

I stand ready to address your questions. Thank you