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On behalf of our faculty and staff, I am pleased to present our Continuous Improvement Review report describing our School’s activities during the 2015-2019 review period.

We are proud of our accomplishments and progress during the past five years, and we are confident that we have a firm foundation of excellent people and quality processes that will enable us to continue to improve during the years to come.

This report has been prepared according to AACSB guidelines for reviews conducted under the 2013 business standards (with 2018 updates). We are ready to provide any additional information regarding this report, and we look forward to a productive visit with our team members during February 23-25, 2020.

Keith F. Snider
Dean
1. Mission and Vision

The mission of the Naval Postgraduate School (NPS):

“To provide relevant and unique advanced education and research programs to increase the combat effectiveness of commissioned officers of the naval service to enhance the security of the United States. In support of the foregoing and to sustain academic excellence, NPS will foster a program of relevant and meritorious thesis and research experiences for NPS students that informs the curricula, supports the needs of Navy and Department of Defense, and builds the intellectual capital of NPS faculty. To support the core Navy mission, NPS’ programs are inherently joint, inter-agency, and international.”

The mission of the Graduate School of Defense Management (GSDM) supports the NPS mission in areas pertaining to defense management and policy - To serve our nation by:

- Educating U.S. and international military and Department of Defense (DoD) civilians in defense-focused business and public policy,
- Conducting scholarly research in defense management and public policy,
- Providing intellectual resources for leaders and organizations concerned with national defense management practice and policies

Our vision is for GSDM to be, and to be recognized as, the Nation’s premier defense-focused business management and public policy school.

Several commitments flow from our mission and vision statements. These are the enduring, top-level values and priorities that guide our strategies, goals, and actions.

- Serve with excellence our students and our curriculum and research stakeholders.
- Seek to be the first choice of defense management and policy stakeholders for their education and research needs.
- Anticipate and be prepared to pursue new education and research opportunities consistent with our capabilities.
- Maintain AACSB and NASPAA accreditations as signs of our quality programs, faculty, and processes.
- Ensure faculty have robust opportunities for professional and disciplinary research.
- Minimize bureaucratic burden and organizational hindrances.
- Promote an organizational climate of openness, collegiality, integrity, and mutual respect.

To accomplish its mission, GSDM offers two resident degree programs--the Defense-Focused MBA and the MS in Management, as well as a nonresident/distance learning (DL) EMBA program and two nonresident MS degrees in acquisition management. Each program consists of a management core, a sequence of courses in a defense-focused concentration (e.g., financial management, contracting), and a capstone project. Resident students are assigned to NPS to pursue full-time studies in one of our degree concentration areas in anticipation of their filling specific assignments in those areas after graduation. Nonresident students attend part-time, typically taking two classes per quarter. New programs have been developed and approved and will be offered in 2020.
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In addition to their teaching, GSDM faculty serve their respective disciplines in research and service, and they develop streams of research in defense-specific topics as well. Most faculty come from traditional civilian doctoral programs, though GSDM also has some active-duty and retired military faculty members.

2. Strategic Planning
Our periodic strategic planning process (plans completed in 2007, 2010, 2014, and 2018) provides the main impetus for review and action towards mission accomplishment. The most recent 2018 plan reviewed the status of accomplishment of the 2014 plan’s goals and, in the context of an assessment of the current environment—judged to be favorable for growth and innovation—set four broad new goals:

- Extend graduate education opportunities to unreached Naval populations
- Expand/pursue new research opportunities
- Increase recognition of the GSBPP [now GSDM] brand
- Continue/expand current process improvement efforts

Important outcomes on specific actions taken in furtherance of these goals include:

- Successful revision/reduction of the resident MBA/MS degree core, intended to provide increased elective opportunities for students, and to free up teaching resources for new educational offerings
- Development and deployment of several graduate certificates to reach new students and encourage innovation in teaching/course delivery
- Development of a 12-month Professional MBA (begun in 2018, approved in 2019 with first offering in July 2020) to reach new students and allow increased flexibility in curriculum content
- Enhancement of processes to assess student learning
- Changing the name of our School to better signal our defense-focused “niche” to external stakeholders

3. Significant Engagement, Innovation, and Impact Outcomes (in addition to those above):

- DoD comptroller officials accepted our proposal to develop a CFO certificate for the defense financial management workforce
- Faculty (Gibbons, Thomas) delivered first two of expected several dozen cross-cultural competency courses to Defense Security Cooperation Agency workforce members
- Faculty (Augier, Dew, Lewis) consulted and advised Navy leadership on the Secretary of the Navy’s “Education for Sea Power” (E4S) initiative
- Selected graduating students briefed their thesis projects to senior Naval leaders
- We hired a full-time faculty associate for instructional design and technology to enhance our educational mission
- We piloted experience tours for financial management and acquisition students, which expose them to operational financial and business practices in various defense organizations
- We developed and fielded a new distance learning studio and test-bed, allowing faculty to deliver and record educational content for our distance-based courses
- We transitioned our distance learning courses from Collaborate to Zoom
- GSDM faculty produced defense-specific/relevant textbooks for Financial Management (Candreva); Acquisition Management (Rendon and Snider)
- Acquisition faculty (Mortlock) won the Project Management Institute Annual Teaching Case Competition with a military-specific case study on developing a new combat helmet. He also developed and delivered one-day immersive workshops for senior acquisition leaders.
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- Gail Thomas received the University of Southern California Marshall School of Business’s “Business Communication Impact Award”
- Faculty’s (Shen, Cunha, Williams) research on military suicide prevention was cited as evidence for White House Executive Order on “Supporting Our Veterans During Their Transition from Uniformed Service to Civilian Life”
- Ned Powley developed a resilience program of explosive ordnance disposal Naval and Marine Corps Reserve communities
- Eva Regnier developed a Hurricane Decision Simulator for the US Marine Corps Reserve; she was also a finalist in the Manufacturing Service Operations Management Practice Based Research Competition
- Our faculty produced 307 peer-reviewed intellectual contributions during the review period. Our top ten most highly cited faculty members have together over 100 items and are cited 495 times in Web of Science.
- 23 of our faculty members serve on editorial boards of 34 different journals.

4. Strengths and Weaknesses
Our main strengths are our unique status as the DoD’s only graduate management school, our mission-driven faculty and staff, our close relationships to our educational and research sponsors, and our defense-focused students. These help us maintain a unique and advantageous niche in the realm of graduate education and research. Our NASPAA accreditation, maintained for over forty years, provides reinforcement. We participate in numerous NASPAA activities, including sending students to participate in NASPAA worldwide simulation competitions, and sponsoring faculty members to NASPAA faculty development events.

Perhaps because of our niche status, we have been challenged in making our capabilities and offerings more widely known throughout DoD. For example, the US Naval Academy in Annapolis continues to outsource to civilian schools its graduate education needs, which we could easily fulfill. Additionally, some potential students may feel a more traditional management degree from a civilian university provides better future career opportunities. We continue to see the need to develop and enhance our reputation in both education and research as a means for making ourselves more prominent in the minds of those seeking capabilities we can provide.

5. Effective Practices – unique or inherent to our success
- Curriculum sponsor engagement. We engage continuously with our curriculum sponsors, the senior DoD officials who send us students and who help us create programs and curricula in response to their needs. For example, the sponsor for our Acquisition and Contract Management curriculum is the Navy’s senior contracting official, who is well positioned not only to articulate the necessary learning outcomes for students, but also to assess the performance of our graduates. Each curriculum sponsor’s needs are reflected in a set of Educational Skills Requirements (ESRs) that are agreed upon between the sponsor and NPS, and which serve as the basis for educational objectives in the curriculum. A biennial review process, formalized in NPS policy, serves to maintain continual engagement and improvement. This institutionalized process of engagement helps to ensure that GSDM curricula are focused on preparing military officers and defense civilians for effective service in critical defense management and policy areas.
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• Research program operations. Our Acquisition Research Program receives financial sponsorship from several senior acquisition-related offices and departments across the DoD. In the last five years, the ARP has provided resources in support over 900 projects by NPS students and faculty, as well as dozens of institutional researchers from around the world. Each year, the Annual Acquisition Research Symposium draws investigators, students, and practitioners/policy-makers to Monterey to discuss research findings and directions for future work.

• Client-based capstone projects. GSDM’s EMBA students complete a problem-solving/consulting project to meet our capstone degree requirements. Teams of 3-4 students engage with a senior DoD leader, acting as the team’s client, to address real-world problems. Feedback from past clients has been most positive, with many clients citing significant resource savings from their teams’ findings and recommendations.

• Student engagement with senior DoD leadership. Selected students from resident curricula provide briefings on their capstone theses/projects to senior DoD officials and their staffs in the Pentagon. This connection benefits both the students and the senior leaders, as well as the faculty members who advise the students.

• Defense relevant capstone projects. Through encouragement from our faculty and support from our sponsors, almost all our students complete a capstone thesis/project with practical and/or theoretical defense relevance. Students and their faculty advisors each benefit through the capstone research process; this provides us with strong evidence of mission accomplishment.
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1. Introduction to the Graduate School of Defense Management

A. Introduction and Overview

The mission of the Naval Postgraduate School (NPS) is to provide relevant and unique advanced education and research programs to increase the combat effectiveness of commissioned officers of the naval service to enhance the security of the United States. In support of the foregoing and to sustain academic excellence, NPS fosters a program of relevant and meritorious thesis and research experiences for NPS students that informs the curricula, supports the needs of Navy and Department of Defense, and builds the intellectual capital of NPS faculty. To support the core Navy mission, NPS' programs are inherently joint, inter-agency, and international.

Our\textsuperscript{1} mission in the Graduate School of Defense Management (GSDM), formerly the Graduate School of Business and Public Policy\textsuperscript{2}, is to serve our Nation by educating U.S. and allied military officers as well as defense civilians in defense-focused business and public policy, by conducting research in defense management and public policy, and by providing intellectual resources for leaders and organizations concerned with defense business management practices and policies.

The defining distinctive for both NPS and GSDM is our defense focus, which drives our mission, our strategy, our objectives, and our daily work, including how we engage with, innovate for, and impact our stakeholders.

B. Scope of Review

1) Current Degree Programs

In support of our mission, GSDM offers five degree programs: our resident Defense Focused MBA, a resident MS in Management, a distance-learning Executive MBA, and distance-learning MS programs in Contract Management (MSCM) and Program Management (MSPM).

2) New Degree Programs (Approved, but Accepting First Students in July)

In line with our strategic plan and in support of recent Navy new guidance, we developed our sixth degree program during the reporting period, a one-year Professional MBA degree. This program is newly approved, and we expect to begin accepting students in July 2020. Thus, we have no experience to report at this time, and it is excluded from this review, though we refer to it where appropriate (e.g., when we discuss opportunities).

\textsuperscript{1} We refer to GSDM as “we/our” throughout the report, switching to the third person (“GSDM”) when doing so clarifies a distinction between GSDM and NPS.

\textsuperscript{2} On October 1, 2019, we changed our name from the Graduate School of Business and Public Policy (GSBPP) to the Graduate School of Defense Management (GSDM). We refer to ourselves by that new name, referring to GSBPP only when it is contextually relevant (e.g., when we update on concerns identified in the previous AACSB review report).
This table summarizes the degree programs included in this review:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>Delivery Mode</th>
<th>2019 Graduates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MBA</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS in Management (MSM)</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMBA</td>
<td>Distance (Synchronous web-enabled)</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS in Contract Management (MSCM)</td>
<td>Distance (Synchronous web-enabled)</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS in Program Management (MSPM)</td>
<td>Distance (Synchronous web-enabled)</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Institutional and School Overview

A. Situational Analysis

1) Historical, National, Local, and Other Factors

The Navy established what would become the Naval Postgraduate School in 1909 at the Naval Academy in Annapolis. Following World War II, Congress passed legislation to make NPS a fully accredited, degree-granting graduate school. After Congress authorized the purchase of the historic Hotel Del Monte in 1947, NPS relocated to Monterey in 1951.

Originally a school dedicated to science and engineering, NPS began offering management education in the 1950s. GSDM’s history can be traced back to the former Department of Administrative Sciences, which later was renamed as the Department of Systems Management. The Department successfully obtained NASPAA accreditation for its resident degrees in 1980 and maintains this accreditation to the present.

In 2000, the NPS President reorganized the university into four graduate schools, directing that Department of Systems Management become the Graduate School of Business and Public Policy and begin offering the MBA degree. Essentially, a department with a chair became a school with a dean, and in some ways, we still function today like one department. We have Area Chairs responsible for the various faculty groups, but they do not have their own budgets or staff, and administration is centralized at the School level.

Since 2000, we’ve had five Deans: the first, Kenneth J. Euske, was also our last department Chair; two hired from outside NPS—Douglas A. Brook and Robert N. Beck, each of whom served for a three-year term; William R. Gates, who served for just over ten years; and Keith Snider, appointed in March 2019.

In 2012–2013, both the NPS President and Provost were dismissed in consequence of findings by the Navy’s Inspector General. Over the next three to four years, NPS experienced increased scrutiny and some restrictions, such as a hiring freeze, limitations on the amount of reimbursable work that could be accepted, and higher level review of conference attendance. As of mid-2019, however, concerns by higher headquarters over NPS operations have been satisfactorily addressed, to the point where all of our pre-IG authorities have been fully restored.

As noted earlier, and consistent with our strategic goal of “brand recognition,” the School’s name was changed to GSDM effective October 1, 2019.
Both NPS and GSDM have changed leadership during the reporting period. NPS welcomed a new President, Vice Admiral (Retired) Ann Rondeau, Ed.D. (2019) and a new Provost, Steve Lerman, Ph.D. (2016), and GSDM welcomed Dean Snider (2019). President Rondeau served on the Executive Board for the Navy’s “Education for Seapower” (E4S) study, which we discuss later in this report (see also Appendices A1 and A2). Already in her brief tenure, President Rondeau has engaged actively with Naval leadership and our educational sponsors on directions from the E4S study.

Such proactive engagement by all NPS leaders is important, given our distance (2500 miles; 3 hour time difference) from the Navy’s “center of gravity” in Washington, DC. Frequent travel to the east coast to meet with stakeholders is essential.

Monterey is a world-class tourist destination, which helps attract students and faculty to come to NPS. The high cost of living on the Central Coast, however, discourages others.

As a Navy-run university, NPS is subject to Federal and Navy rules, regulations, and processes governing aspects of administration, including financial management, procurement, human resources management (including hiring, pay), timekeeping, and travel. As NPS faculty members are Federal employees appointed under Schedule A of the Excepted Service, they are obligated to operate within these processes, which yields a climate of compliance not found in other universities. Most NPS administrative staff members are GS (General Service) employees.

2) Relative Advantages and Disadvantages

We continue to view our relative advantages as stemming from (1) our unique status as the Navy’s graduate school; (2) our mission-driven faculty and staff, (3) our close relationships to our educational and research sponsors, and (4) our students.

Because NPS operates and is funded by the Navy as its graduate school, Naval (i.e., Navy and Marine Corps) officers are assigned to NPS to obtain graduate degrees as an integral component of their military careers. The Navy determines the number of officers to attend NPS each year in various curricula based on the number of positions to be filled in the Navy’s fleet and shore establishments. This annual quota of Naval students has remained relatively stable over recent years and is expected to remain so in the near future. As a result, we spend less effort on recruiting than a typical university, and none on placement, as all of our graduates have assignments waiting for them. Obviously, this stability enhances our ability to plan.

None of the other Services (Army, Air Force, Coast Guard) and only a few other nations have defense-focused graduate management schools. This means that GSDM is often a school of choice for other-than-Naval students.

We have 71 full and part-time faculty members (approximately 62 full-time equivalents) from academic, professional, civilian, and military service backgrounds with strengths in graduate instruction and research spanning many domains, including acquisition, program management, contracting, financial management, logistics, manpower and systems analysis, and information technology management. Our faculty is mission-driven and includes active duty (8) and retired (12) military officers, who offer critical mission-related context, whether it be currency or depth of
experience in military service. Several of our military faculty have academic qualifications as well, while the remainder are professionally qualified and hold master’s degrees.  

We engage with our curriculum sponsors—senior DoD/Naval leaders of various areas of defense management (e.g., acquisition, manpower)—to create degree programs and curricula in response to educational needs they identify. Each curriculum sponsor’s needs are reflected in a set of Educational Skills Requirements (ESRs) that are agreed upon between the sponsor and NPS, and which serve as the basis for educational objectives in the curriculum. This helps to ensure that GSDM curricula are focused on preparing military officers and defense civilians for effective service in designated defense management and policy areas.

Along with our educational engagement with our sponsors, we also have strong engagement with research sponsors. For example, our Acquisition Research Program (ARP), founded in 2003, is running strong. The program receives financial sponsorship from several senior acquisition-related offices and departments across the DoD. The ARP defines acquisition research broadly and supports research in all GSDM disciplines. In the last five years, the ARP has sponsored over 900 projects by NPS students, faculty, and non-NPS faculty researchers. Along with dedicated programs like ARP, our faculty also compete successfully to receive research funding from sponsors through the Naval Research Program, which is funded by the Chief of Naval Operations to support research projects for current and future warfighter challenges facing the Navy and Marine Corps. Our faculty regularly engages with other research sponsors in areas such as energy, cyber, and critical infrastructure protection. These engagements, focused on innovative challenges facing our warfighters, provide relevant intellectual products to our sponsors and often lead to ongoing research relationships.

We view our accreditation by the Network of Schools of Public Policy, Affairs, and Administration (NASPAA) as an advantage. Because our mission is to educate our students in defense-focused business and public policy, we believe this dual accreditation complements our AACSB accreditation, by demonstrating our ability to provide management education to students who will serve in the public arena. We have been consistently in the top 25% of NASPAA schools in annual US News & World Report rankings, and in 2018, we were the top-ranked of eight NASPAA schools in the specialized category of Homeland/National Security.

Finally, our students are a distinct advantage. Almost all have practical operational military experience. Most are mature, respectful, task-oriented, and trained in leadership and teamwork. They appreciate that learning and successful degree completion will advance their careers. Most know the types of jobs they will fill upon graduation and so are motivated to direct their studies to success in those assignments. (See Appendix B for a list of titles of recent graduates’ capstone projects, which demonstrates that almost every graduate performs a defense-relevant project.) Students demand relevance and currency in their classes, which sets a high bar for the faculty to maintain an appropriate focus on both mission and discipline.

3) Challenges

We face challenges, both short- and long-term. Some of our challenges relate to our role as a university within the Department of the Navy and the broader Federal government, and others are specific to our school. To some extent, the challenges we discussed during our most recent CIR remain in place, although we have taken steps to mitigate them (see part B below).

---

3 Throughout this report, numbers such as faculty counts might vary slightly, based on the date of the supporting documentation available.
During the reporting period, NPS faced budget pressures, both external (e.g., from sequestration and from Navy direct and reimbursable funding changes) and from internal competition for resources. The frequent use of shorter-term continuing resolutions to fund the Federal government can engender uncertainty and instability in our budget execution, and the two most recent government shutdowns (2018 and 2018/19) remind us that, although one was brief and we were exempt from the other shutdown, our sources of funding remain to some extent outside our control. Even assuming stable funding, we face a systemic challenge common to government organizations: our primary funding has a one-year duration, and funding that we do not spend within that fiscal year expires. We cannot, for example, save money from one year toward a larger need the following year. At a more mundane level, travel to events such as conferences early in the fiscal year is always more challenging, because we must wait until the new funding for that fiscal year arrives.

We discuss our GSDM budget in more detail in section 3, but our direct funding has not remained stable; it decreased to roughly 80% of its 2015 level (gratifyingly, it has actually increased from its low of 72.6% of its 2015 level) and our reimbursable funding for education and research has decreased to 70% of its 2015 level, again having actually recovered slightly from the lowest point of 65% of its 2015 level. We discuss this decline in section 3. We note that the previous report cautioned us to plan for such exigencies, and we are pleased to report that our planning has softened the blow (see part B of this section below).

We discuss the relaxation of some constraints as a form of opportunity below, but we still operate under several administrative constraints mostly tied to our position within the Navy and the Federal government. NPS recently implemented the DoD’s Defense Performance Management and Appraisal Program (DPMAP), which creates administrative burdens throughout the year, although it does provide us a systematic means of conducting our annual appraisals. A new financial system, that does not yet integrate fully with other systems such as our travel system, is causing administrative problems. The Navy’s telework policies place constraints on our faculty, as does our pay system, which requires biweekly timecards. Finally, the DoD’s travel system adds administrative load to our faculty and staff, while imposing constraints uncommon to most other universities.

The Navy recently revised its graduate education policy to require in-residence graduate education as a mandatory precursor for all officers assuming major command positions (see Appendices A1 and A2). While this also presents opportunities (see below), these opportunities may come at the cost of our distance learning EMBA program, which has served the Navy’s aviation community since 2003. Those aviation officers must now attend a residence program to advance in their careers, so any gains to our resident program may cannibalize our distance learning program.

While we no longer under a hiring freeze, we face salary pressures in some academic areas. Because NPS faculty are Federal employees, their salaries are statutorily capped ($176,900 in 2019, which includes a locality adjustment). The figure below shows the average assistant professor nine-month salary for our peer and aspirant schools compared with the NPS pay cap, also adjusted to a nine-month figure. Many of our full professors, particularly in financial management, earn a twelve-month salary below the market average for even a nine-month assistant professor salary. Monterey’s high

---

4 Congress authorizes and allocates funding for Federal agencies, including the Department of the Navy, for different purposes, and the funds are available to spend only for specific periods of time. Authority to use these funds expires at the end of their authorized time periods. Most of our funding is available for only one year, expiring at the end of the fiscal year.
cost of living adds to the pressure, as does the need to maintain a defense-focus to our faculty members’ research programs.

GSDM faces competition for NPS’ limited resources. While the new budget model discussed elsewhere (see part B of this section and Section 3) may provide some relief, we face stable resident student loads, increased program requirements, and stable-to-declining budgets.

We do not own our real property. We cannot upgrade facilities through new construction or facility improvement beyond minor, cosmetic-level changes.

In terms of defense management graduate education, GSDM has few competitors. Syracuse University has for many years operated a comptroller/financial management course for the US Army. George Washington University delivers courses related to contract management. Earlier in 2019, George Mason University established a Center for Government Contracting. Competition for students is more likely to come from institutions located in the vicinity of Naval/DoD installations, as well as from on-line programs. NPS is statutorily precluded from accepting tuition assistance or GI Bill funding from students.

Regarding research, few universities have researchers who focus on defense management, so GSDM faculty have advantages when competing for funding from Naval/DoD sources. GSDM faculty also have advantages over non-Federal researchers in access to DoD data sources.

4) Opportunities

Helping to balance our challenges are significant opportunities. The Navy’s new E4S initiative (Appendices A1 and A2) directly emphasizes the value of education, and not just training, as a warfighting advantage for the Navy. Recent guidance from the Chief of Naval Operations, the senior naval military officer, states, “Learning is the ultimate warfare enabler and the intellectual
development of our Sailors provides our most critical warfighting capabilities.”
(https://www.navy.mil/cno/docs/CNO%20FRAGO%20012019.pdf)

Many of our own strategic goals—specifically, expanding our educational reach—are aligned very well with E4S and provide excellent opportunities to support and implement Navy leaders’ directions. Our stackable distance education sequences of courses grant educational certificates and can combine to lead to a graduate degree (the specific degree is TBD). While not our primary purpose for offering the certificates, they offer the potential for new revenue streams from the unreached populations. We have just begun offering our first certificates under an open enrollment model.

We also significantly revised our core educational course matrix (discussed more in section 5), to create time for our students to take elective courses. Formerly, our matrix was largely lock-step for each academic specialization; the new matrix enables students to tailor their degree somewhat to their perceived or desired future career goals. Additionally, the reduction in resident core offerings frees up resources for new programs.

We are working to expand our service to unreached populations in both areas with large military concentration, e.g., the National Capital Region, Pearl Harbor, San Diego, and Norfolk, and anywhere we can reach students via such tools as Zoom and other emerging technologies. We plan to seek civilian university partners for joint degrees, in which our partner(s) would teach core MBA courses, while we would offer defense-focused specialty courses.

Another opportunity we are pursuing is bringing the US Naval Academy’s Leadership Education and Development program back in-house. This program, which we developed and offered on-site at the Naval Academy in the early 2000s, has been outsourced to other universities for the last decade. We could support the program at lower cost and create strategic linkages with the US Naval Academy. Under the E4S initiative, which envisions a Navy-wide university system, we see this as a compelling opportunity.

A relative opportunity is the recent relaxation of some administrative constraints. For example, financial policies constrained our accepting reimbursable work for which our portion of the total work represented less than 51% of the total costs, and audit concerns within the Department of the Navy led to a burdensome travel approval process for NPS.

In research, we are focusing on building broad research themes to address complex strategic issues. For example, we are leveraging our on-going research programs in defense acquisition and strategic communication, while building our expertise in defense talent management (an area of emphasis in the NPS strategic plan), humanitarian assistance and disaster relief, and defense supply chain management. In the area of talent management specifically, and consistent with our strategic plan, we seek to develop modelling tools to support to help answer pressing talent management issues.

In addition to school level development of these broad research themes, the GSDM faculty members are entrepreneurial and engage with a diversity of research sponsors. The research sponsors that our faculty members have worked with include civilian entities (such as the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation, the NPS Foundation), Navy agencies (such as Submarine Forces, U.S. Pacific Fleet, Naval Supply Systems Command), other military services (such as Army Deputy Chief of Staff, Secretary of the Air Force), Department of Defense level organizations (such as the Defense Health Agencies, Defense Logistics Agency, Defense Security Cooperation Agency), and other federal entities (such as Center for Medicare and Medicaid Services, US Department of Veterans Affairs). A more
comprehensive list of external sponsors of GSDM research in the past five years is included as Appendix C.

B. Progress Update on Issues from Previous Review

AACSB’s decision letter dated 24 April 2015 (Appendix D), extending our accreditation through 2019, identified two items for us to address.

1) The GSBPP [now GSDM] is in a difficult budgetary situation in that it does not control many of the levers that affect it and is constrained by limitations on generating additional revenue; in particular, it cannot generate a profit on any program, cannot transfer resources derived from one program to support another, and is not allowed to solicit funds from individuals or organizations on its own. This requires a delicate balancing act in the best of times. Under current federal government circumstances, especially for the military services, the challenges are magnified. The School should develop contingency plans for addressing different possible outcomes of the current avenues of financing. It may be impossible to control the outcomes themselves, but some scenario planning will prepare it to respond quickly to sudden changes in its environment. (Standard 3: Financial Strategies and Allocation of Resources)

2) The academic qualifications of faculty in one subject area, Acquisition, and two degree programs, MS in Contract Management and MS in Program (Systems Acquisition) Management, raise questions. The School argues that these are such applied areas that Scholarly Academic (SA) faculty are difficult to identify. However, as the acquisitions field is a subset of the Operations Management discipline, GSBPP [now GSDM] should consider hiring an SA qualified faculty member which would contribute to the intellectual rigor of work in this area. (2013 Standard 15: Faculty Qualifications and Engagement)

We have taken action to improve in both areas.

1) **Budgetary concerns:** The budgetary environment that resulted in concern over Standard 3 has improved significantly since the 2015 Continuous Improvement Review. Our strategic plan, developed by the faculty, had been to expand reimbursable-funded teaching and research programs to counterbalance potential Department of Navy budget reductions and mitigate the budgetary constraints detailed in the concern over Standard 3. At the time of the review, NPS (and therefore, GSDM’s) capacity to accept and perform reimbursable programs was under review by Department of Navy. Additionally, GSDM was constrained in hiring sufficient faculty to support reimbursable programs, while Department of Navy reviewed the total number of staff, administration and faculty billets allowed at NPS. That review has been completed and GSDM has a defined number of staff, administration and faculty positions applicable to the directly-funded mission of the school, and is also allowed to request, with justification, additional positions, in support of reimbursable-funded programs.

As a Department of Defense entity, GSDM remains constrained by several budgetary and financial regulations not normally imposed on state or private universities. However, a positive conclusion of the aforementioned reviews positions the school to continue with the original strategies regarding development of, and execution of, financial contingency plans.

Additionally, we successfully advocated for a new budget model at NPS. Through FY19, NPS administration used a complex model based on a number of factors to determine allocations of its direct budget to the four Schools. Factors included, for example, the number of tenure-track faculty and the number of sections taught in each School. This model had several deficiencies
that led to perverse incentives and situations in which actions in one School had direct and adverse effects on other Schools’ budgets. The new budget model, which we discuss in the strategy section of this report, avoids this problem. While it does not in itself add a funding stream, this new budget model insulates us somewhat from unexpected budget changes based on another school’s internal decision-making processes.

We have developed a series of stackable educational certifications, typically series of 4 courses, that we have recently begun offering under an open-enrollment model to untapped markets, primarily non-resident customers, and especially to non-resident Federal government civilians. While our certificate initiative serves other purposes as well, it offers the potential to create new funding streams for our school from previously untapped markets. Our new Professional MBA program, which we will begin in July 2020, offers a new funding stream; students from other services and other countries will bring us additional tuition (paid by their sponsoring organizations) and we expect resident Naval officer enrollment to increase, bringing with it an increase in Naval direct funding.

2) Academic qualifications in Acquisition: GSDM placed significant attention to faculty qualifications and engagement in response to the concern over Standard 15. Of immediate concern and action, was to more carefully monitor deployment of SA faculty across the various academic programs, paying particular attention to the more “practitioner” oriented programs. A simple, but effective, approach has been to deliberately plan for and make course assignments in alignment with Standard 15. While we continue to seek candidates with the SA qualification, the hiring environment remains relatively limited in this regard. Our unique mission in this academic area—specifically related to Department of Defense acquisition management—requires that we recruit largely from the Department of Defense workforce. We are currently focusing recruiting efforts to attract candidates with the practitioner experience/expertise we require, but who also have a research terminal degree. More immediately, we have engaged in three in-house mitigating factors:

- Shortly after the 2015 CIR, GSBPP hired a Department of Defense acquisition management practitioner, who also holds a research PhD in a non-business related discipline. The faculty member has since completed the AACSB Post-Doctoral Bridge to Business program at University of Florida.
- A practitioner faculty member who typically teaches in the Operations and Logistics Management curriculum and in the Acquisition Management curriculum, is expected to be awarded a research PhD in 2020.
- A practitioner faculty member, hired in 2012 specifically for his expertise in acquisition management, is currently pursuing a research PhD with expected award next year.

We have also hired a new faculty member, who is enrolled in a PhD program. We believe these factors will dramatically increase our Scholarly Academic sufficiency metrics, while still providing the Department of Defense- specific practical experience inherent in our academic mission.

The committee also suggested as a point of emphasis that we explore how we could best implement post-tenure reviews for our faculty. The committee recommended we explore this in part because we face constraints in our ability to offer incentives such as extra pay or reduced workload. With the adoption of the DoD’s new annual performance review system, the Defense Performance Management and Appraisal Program (DPMAP), we have a more rigorous tool available to support post-tenure reviews. While it does not directly improve our incentives, it does allow us to address a hypothetical case of a post-tenure faculty member not meeting minimum standards.

C. Substantive Changes (Not Applicable)
3. Strategic Management and Innovation

A. Strategic Management Planning Process and Outcomes

Our past strategic plans (2007, 2010, 2014, and 2018) have all been developed under similar processes. They have generally entailed 12-18 month efforts led by strategy committees consisting of the Dean, Associate Deans, and one of our faculty members who specializes in strategy and strategic planning. Periodic updates are given during monthly faculty meetings and “brown bag lunch” meetings. (A new strategy committee was formed in August 2019 with the goal of updating the current 2018 plan in light of E4S directions and opportunities.)

The strategy effort that led to the current 2018 plan approved by Dean Gates began in late 2016 and was motivated by changes—mostly favorable—in our external environment. Most notably, some restrictions under which NPS had been operating as a result of the 2013 Navy’s Inspector General report (e.g., hiring freeze) began to be lifted, and our new Provost was encouraging growth in reimbursable work. Additionally, NPS began its own strategic planning effort during this time, and we wanted to keep abreast of those developments.

The 2018 Strategic Plan (Appendix E) set the following broad goals and objectives (status on each provided in bold capitals):

Goal 1: Extend graduate education opportunities to unreached Naval populations
- Obtain approval for changes to the resident core. **DONE. IMPLEMENTED WITH JULY 2019 COHORTS.**
- Conduct needs assessment for educating submarine officers. **DONE. NO FEASIBLE SOLUTIONS FOUND DUE TO SUB OFFICERS’ WORK SCHEDULE TURBULENCE. CONTINUE TO MONITOR SUB OFFICERS’ ENROLLMENTS IN NEW CERTIFICATES, EMBA, AND PMBA**
- Support at least two faculty members to develop asynchronous versions of core courses for pilot during AY19. **NOT ACCOMPLISHED DUE TO BUDGET/WORKLOAD CONSTRAINTS. REVISITING IN AY20.**
- Complete proposal(s) for certificates and certificate-based DL degree program(s) – **CERTIFICATES APPROVED AND OPEN FOR ENROLLMENT. DEGREE TBD.**

Goal 2: Expand/pursue new research opportunities
- Convene an Acquisition Research Summit in NCR with stakeholders to discuss collaboration opportunities and priorities. **NOT ACCOMPLISHED DUE TO SPONSOR PRIORITIES AND BUDGET REDUCTIONS.**
- Establish talent management research program under Center for Defense Management Research (CDMR) and obtain fenced, multi-year Naval Research Program funding to support. **PROPOSED AND SUPPORTED IN CONCEPT BUT NOT FUNDED. EFFORTS CONTINUE.**

Goal 3: Increase recognition of the GSBPP brand (i.e., retain previous Goal #5)
- Committee has been re-established to focus on “reputation” -- future actions await its report/recommendations. **COMMITTEE REPORTED IN NOV 2018. ACTIONS RE REPUTATION INCLUDE MARKETING OF CERTIFICATES AND NAME CHANGE TO GSDM.**

Goal 4: Continue/expand current process improvement efforts
- Complete a full round of Assurance of Learning (AOL) assessments under the revised program competencies and associated rubrics. **DONE**
- Expand rewards (e.g., DL teaching awards; awards for high-impact PRJs; teaching innovation awards; staff impact awards). **SOME PROGRESS, E.G., EMBA TEACHING AWARD APPROVED. NEW GSDM RESEARCH**
AWARDS ESTABLISHED FOR DISCIPLINARY AND DEFENSE-FOCUSED PUBLICATIONS. FUNDS RESERVED IN THE GSDM BUDGET FOR MONETARY SPECIAL ACT AND PERFORMANCE AWARDS.

- Expand collaboration in teaching (e.g., cross-functional cases). **SOME PROGRESS: CROSS FUNCTIONAL CASES (E.G., OPNS MGT-ECON-FM) DEVELOPED/ DELIVERED. TEACHING INNOVATION/EFFECTIVENESS BROWN-BAG LUNCHES. ASYNCHRONOUS COLLABORATIVE COURSE DEVELOPMENT PROPOSED FOR AY20 (ECON-OPNS MGT).**

The most significant continuous improvement achievements since the 2015 CIR would include:

- Revision/reduction of the resident MBA/MS degree core to enhance student learning and free up resources for other initiatives
- Development and deployment of several graduate certificates to reach new students and encourage innovation in teaching/course delivery
- Development of a 12-month Professional MBA (begun in 2018, approved in 2019 with first offering in July 2020) to reach new students and allow increased flexibility in curriculum content.
- Enhancement of processes to assess student learning
- Changing the name of our School

**NOTE ON OUR RECENT NAME CHANGE:** In late 2016, our Strategy Committee began discussing a name change, and the committee proposed a change to “Graduate School of Defense Management” at the March 2017 faculty meeting. The sense of the faculty was, however, against this proposal, with most feeling that a name change was not necessary. The matter was not pursued further until early 2019 with the arrival of our new President. She encouraged us to reconsider, mainly to address potential misperceptions among Navy and DoD leaders who, if unfamiliar with NPS, might question why the Navy maintained a business school. Throughout May and June of 2019, our faculty discussed various alternatives, with surveys taken to narrow preferred choices. A final survey was administered in July; this asked the faculty to state their support for two choices: Graduate School of Defense Management, and Graduate School of Defense Management and Public Policy. Most of the faculty responded that they supported or could live with either choice, but a larger majority supported the first choice. The Dean subsequently recommended to the President and Provost that they approve the new name, and October 1 was set as the implementation date. Many NPS offices were involved in implementing the successful change.

B. **Financial Strategies and Allocation of Resources**

1) **Overall GSDM Budget**

We noted in our last report that, based on Federal fiscal realities, NPS expected its traditional funding sources to fall by as much as 15% from its 2014 baseline. Over the next few years, that funding decline occurred, and in combination with other factors, drove our GSDM direct funding to 80% of its 2015 level in FY2017. Our reimbursable funding for education and research also decreased to 70% of its 2015 level by FY2017. Overall, our funding since 2017 has stabilized and even increased slightly. In part, the funding decline resulted from the renewed focus on the so-called 51% rule, which constrained our accepting reimbursable work for which our portion of the total work represented less than 51% of the total costs. Because of this constraint, sponsors chose to fund transactions through other universities rather than through NPS. Several principal investigators (e.g., Kidalov, Euske, Dillard, Yoho) are no longer members of our faculty, reducing the number of PIs receiving reimbursable funding from 14 in FY15 to 7 in FY19. We absorbed this decrease in part through employing fewer participating faculty members and relying slightly more on adjunct faculty members. This reduction in faculty came in part by not replacing some faculty who retired.
In FY2019, our budget breakdown was 49% direct funding and 51% reimbursable funding. We expect FY20 to be similar (52% direct funding, 48% reimbursable funding), with the difference being an increase in direct funding of almost $400K, and an anticipated decrease in sponsored research of approximately $750K.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY19</th>
<th>FY20</th>
<th>Percent of total budget</th>
<th>Percent of total budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DIRECT</td>
<td>$9,095,859</td>
<td>$9,496,000</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REIMBURSABLE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPONSORED EDUCATION</td>
<td>$4,935,470</td>
<td>$4,950,000</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPONSORED RESEARCH</td>
<td>$4,249,996</td>
<td>$3,500,000</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDIRECT</td>
<td>$198,000</td>
<td>$180,000</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL REIMBURSABLE</td>
<td>$9,383,466</td>
<td>$8,630,000</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>$18,479,325</td>
<td>$18,126,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2) GSDM Funding

NPS, like the rest of the Navy, operates on a fiscal year from October 1 – September 30. NPS receives annual funding directly from the Navy, the amount of which is determined by the federal budgeting process and is not tied to numbers of enrolled students. This direct Navy funding is intended to cover educational program costs for all Department of the Navy (i.e., Navy and Marine Corps) students in resident and DL graduate courses. No students can pay their own tuition, nor may NPS accept tuition assistance or GI Bill funding; all students are sponsored by their individual commands or agencies. The amount of this direct funding, plus the projected annual tuition for non-Naval officer resident students (e.g., Army and Air Force students,
international officers, and government civilians), constitutes the total NPS direct budget, which we refer to as central funding.

For GSDM, all resident students and the Naval officers in our EMBA program are centrally funded; the civilian EMBA students and most of the students in our DL MSCM and MSPM programs are reimbursably-funded.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education Programs</th>
<th>Mission Funded (Naval Students)</th>
<th>Reimbursably-Funded (non-Naval Officer Students)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Resident Programs</td>
<td>In Central NPS Budget</td>
<td>Tuition in Central NPS Budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance/Hybrid Programs</td>
<td>In Central NPS Budget</td>
<td>Tuition Decentralized to Schools</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is a relationship between our reimbursable students and our reimbursable funding. The students’ sponsors pay a predetermined tuition per student per class; we will not start a cohort of reimbursable students unless the enrollment is sufficient to cover all program costs; federal regulations preclude using direct funds to subsidize reimbursable students, and vice versa; federal regulations also preclude us from earning a profit on reimbursable programs.

For centrally-funded students, there is less of a relationship between GSDM’s budget and student population. NPS receives its direct budget through the federal budgeting process and its students through a student quota model process, each run independently of the other. Budget fluctuations and changes in student loads are not directly related. Once NPS receives its direct budget allocation, funding is distributed to the schools based on a model that builds the departments’ and schools’ requirements. GSDM receives a share of the central budget that reflects its share of the total NPS educational requirements.

Historically, GSDM’s budget has fallen short of our calculated requirements. However, our faculty members routinely take on teaching overloads relative to our standard workload expectations (see the next section for details), and they sometimes use reimbursable funding rather than rely on central funding for their labor; in combination, these efforts have allowed us to operate within our central budget allocation. The previous review team noted our funding challenges, and as we noted in section 2, a new funding model and other initiatives, such as our stackable certificates and the Navy E4S, offer the promise of helping to mitigate some past funding challenges. Our new one-year Professional MBA, offered in collaboration with NPS’ School for International Graduate Studies, will offer some potential for increase revenue.

3) GSDM Financial Allocation

The standard faculty workload model for our tenure track faculty includes two courses per quarter (courses typically meet three to four hours per week over eleven weeks, plus a one-week finals period). GSDM uses course sections as the workload metric, but we expect all faculty members to bear a fair share of student project or thesis advising load and to provide appropriate service contributions.

Tenure track faculty members teaching for two quarters (four total course segments) receive salary for three quarters; the third quarter provides for service and NPS-funded research
opportunities. We refer to this as the “nine-month model (9MM)”\(^5\). We expect tenure track faculty members to secure funding for their fourth quarter, either from external sponsors or from internal GSDM/NPS research programs. Tenure-track faculty without fourth-quarter funding may request additional teaching. Non-tenure track faculty members typically teach for three or four quarters per year (eight total course sections). They do not receive the NPS-funded quarter, and but we encourage them to seek external or internal research/consulting funding. Faculty members serving in GSDM administrative positions may have reduced teaching loads.

GSDM attempts to limit student enrollment to 25–30 students per class. We feel this is the optimal size for student learning and faculty workload considerations; we have no teaching assistants, so course instructors are responsible for all grading and student assistance. The common core classes can be larger, and the curriculum concentration courses are typically smaller than our target class size. With careful management, our budget has been sufficient to cover our teaching requirements, the tenure track release quarter, and faculty equipment and travel.

In discussing GSDM’s financial strategy, it is important to note the funding limitations we face. We cannot accept tuition assistance or GI Bill funding from our students. As part of the federal government, we are specifically precluded from pricing reimbursable programs to earn a surplus at the expense of other federal agencies. We can price these programs so they cover all program costs, including curriculum and faculty development costs. As a result, most strategic initiatives must be self-financing or funded out of our normal direct budget, although the NPS Foundation, a non-profit organization on campus, offers some support as well.

4) New Funding Model and Possible Implications

Through FY19 the NPS administration used a complex model based on a number of factors to determine allocations of its direct budget to the four Schools. Factors included, for example, the number of tenure-track faculty and the number of sections taught in each School. This model had several deficiencies that led to perverse incentives and situations in which actions in one School had direct and adverse effects on other Schools’ budgets.

To remedy these problems, the Provost and Vice Provost, with the strong advocacy of Dean Bill Gates, undertook over the past year the development of a new direct budget allocation model for FY20 and beyond based primarily on student FTE in each School. The model uses a six-year rolling average of enrollments to determine an appropriate share or proportion for each School, and the model accounts for varying overhead costs among the four Schools (e.g., higher costs to maintain labs required to educate engineering students). The Provost retains a small proportion of budget to allocate to designated strategic initiatives in the Schools. He then expects each Dean, once allocated a budget, to make appropriate management decisions based on the School’s particular needs and priorities.

\(^5\) The tenure-track faculty funding model is based on the academic year with an associated intersessional period. Appointments are currently made using a nine-month model, with a three-month intersessional. Tenure-track faculty on this model receive nine months of institutional funding and are typically expected to teach four courses and perform research and provide service, as detailed in the tenure-track position descriptions and specified in the offer of employment letter. The intersessional period may be filled with a variety of activities such as research or presenting short courses, classroom instruction when requested by the Academic Unit, NPS administrative activities, or leave. The intersessional period may be spread across the academic year as agreed upon with one’s Chair. (NPS Faculty Handbook, p. 14)
This new model has led GSDM to begin re-examining the traditional faculty workload model (the “nine-month model” (9MM)) as a priority area in the just-initiated strategy effort. It opens possibilities for adopting more flexible workload models (e.g., research-intensive and/or teaching-intensive models) and for providing a means for faculty accountability (e.g., release time tied to research productivity). The Dean has chartered a Tenure-Track Faculty Workload Committee to examine and to make recommendations on such possibilities.

5) Strategic Action Items and Funding

We resource strategic action items both internally to GSDM and externally through NPS.

- We hired a new Instructional Design/Instructional Technology Director to provide direct support for GSDM faculty
- We invested in new classroom technology, such as Swivl robots
- We engaged Karen Tarnoff, a well-respected expert on assurance of learning within the AACSB community, to lead a day-long workshop during which we revised and upgraded our assessment program
- We funded NTT faculty (Hudgens, Jones) attending workshops on publishing research
- We funded faculty (Doerr) attending seminars on developing case studies.
- We routinely fund faculty travel to meet with senior Navy and DoD leaders who sponsor our academic programs and research projects
- We routinely fund student travel to perform capstone research
- We granted release time for new course development (technology agility; Reich)

Externally, we seek to resource larger strategic action items through requests to NPS. Illustrative examples from the past two years follow:

**FY19 requests:** $450K total. NPS approved only $90K for the certificates.
- Core revision - $125K. We requested this funding to support our efforts to redesign our core curriculum to update the content and reduce the academic footprint
- Develop DL/resident certificate programs - $125K. We requested this funding to support the process of developing and marketing several certificate programs that cross all disciplinary areas within then-GSBPP (and NPS in some cases).
- Develop a DoD-wide Talent Management Research program - $100K. We requested this funding to support and expand talent management research efforts across NPS for both the active duty and civilian workforces.
- Institutional Advancement - $100K. We requested this funding to create an Institutional Advancement program to communicate our existing programs and activities across DoD and the federal government.

**FY20 requests:** $420K total to explore expansion of new programs and modes of delivery. NPS approved $50K for the badging effort.
- $150K for support for outreach-related faculty labor and travel and promotional materials.
- $125K to develop a badging scheme for one of our certificate programs (TBD) and begin build materials to support the badges.
- Build more coherent programs in talent management. $145K to support outreach-related faculty labor and travel to cultivate research sponsorship, website and research repository development, and Symposium support.
C. GSDM Mission Statement and Summary of Strategic Plan 2018

Mission - To serve our nation by:
• Educating U.S. and International military and DOD civilians in defense-focused business and public policy,
• Conducting scholarly research in defense management and public policy,
• Providing intellectual resources for leaders and organizations concerned with national defense management practice and policies

Vision - To be, and to be recognized as, the Nation’s premier defense-focused business management and public policy school

Commitments - These flow from our mission and vision statements. They are the enduring, top-level values and priorities that guide our strategies, goals, and actions.
• Serve with excellence our students and our sponsors—both curriculum and research.
• Seek to be the first choice of defense management and policy stakeholders for their education and research needs.
• Anticipate and be prepared to pursue new education and research opportunities consistent with our capabilities.
• Maintain AACSB and NASPAA accreditations as signs of our quality programs, faculty, and processes.
• Ensure faculty have robust opportunities for professional and disciplinary research.
• Minimize bureaucratic burden and organizational hindrances.
• Promote an organizational climate of openness, collegiality, integrity, and mutual respect.

The strategic planning effort that resulted in our 2018 plan was carried out from late 2016 through 2017. It was briefed to the faculty in November 2017 and subsequently approved by the Dean in 2018.

The effort entailed an environmental scan of significant developments external to GSDM; these included:
• New Provost is leading NPS strategy development; completion projected later in 2018. Some emerging themes/goals/thrusts (e.g., talent management) are in GSDM’s wheelhouse; others may hold promise for some GSDM play (e.g., management of cyber).
• Post-IG constraints (e.g., hiring freeze, FTE/end-strength caps) have ended. Provost wants to grow reimbursable—mainly research—and is offering additional FTE from his “pool” to grow reimbursable work.
• Mission (direct) budget and end-strength/FTE levels are forecast as flat or decreasing slightly.
• Resident student inputs are forecast as flat or decreasing slightly.
• Nonresident student demand is increasing with addition of third fall EMBA cohort. MSCM/PM programs have growth potential.
• Demand/funding for sponsored research - flat or increasing.
• Continuing or increasing compliance emphasis (e.g., mandatory training, auditability).
• Threats/opportunities from inside campus resulting from NPS initiatives, e.g., cyber.
• Some segments of Navy/DoD continue to be unaware of GSDM capabilities (e.g., USNA contracting out for its graduate education requirements rather than engaging GSDM).
• On the accreditation front, no major changes on the horizon.
• Opportunities and pressures for new research/teaching areas (e.g., talent management, business analytics).
Significant internal developments were noted:

- Several recent and near-term faculty retirements.
- New faculty hires; need continues ...
- EMBA instruction is transitioning from VTE to web-enabled delivery
- Admin/support staff shortages continue
- A sense of “compliance fatigue” pervades (i.e., “living in the world of ‘NO’”)

Assessments of these developments in the context of our mission and vision led to formulation of the aforementioned strategic goals and objectives. Given the lessening of post-IG operating constraints, the encouragement of our new Provost, and our desire to strengthen our reputation for intellectual leadership in defense management, we saw opportunities for growth and innovation in both education and research.

D. Intellectual Contributions

Table 2-1 (Appendices F1, F2) and Table 2-2 (Appendix G) detail our faculty’s intellectual contributions.

Our mission and strategy (see Appendix E) envision that our faculty members will produce a robust portfolio of intellectual contributions (ICs) that advances both their respective disciplines and the state of defense management theory and practice. Such a portfolio and its introduction into our classrooms will help ensure that our graduates are equipped with state-of-the-art disciplinary knowledge and tools for intelligent application as they assume important defense policy and management roles.

Accordingly, we expect that the majority of our faculty’s ICs will be roughly balanced between disciplinary ICs and defense-related ICs. This is reflected in Table 2-1’s rough balance of ICs between basic/discovery (what our faculty would characterize as disciplinary) at 54% of the ICs and applied scholarship (what our faculty would call defense-related) at 37% of the ICs. (Because we do not identify ourselves as primarily a teaching school, we expect – as the data showing just under 9% of the ICs confirms – that the category of teaching/learning scholarship would be least represented in our faculty’s ICs.) We also expect that the most defense-related areas (e.g., Acquisition) would have more ICs in applied than in disciplinary scholarship. Overall, we judge the results of Table 2-1 to be consistent with our mission.

Some specific actions that encourage our desired portfolio of ICs include:

- Provision of “research quarter” coverage for all tenure track faculty members
- Provision of research initiation coverage for new tenure track members (up to a quarter per year for the first three years)
- Stated research expectations in our P&T guidelines
- Stated performance expectations for promotion and retention of non-tenure track faculty
- Mentoring as an element of P&T
- Opportunities to “buy-out” of teaching to pursue promising funded research
- Our research programs and centers (Acquisition Research Program, Center for Defense Management Research) offering funded sponsored opportunities and publication outlets (e.g., Acquisition Research Symposium)
- Promotion of funding opportunities through the NPS Naval Research Program
- Provision of conference travel funding

In terms of the quality of our faculty’s ICs, while we value university press books, reviewed book chapters, and reviewed proceedings to various degrees, we pay the most attention to PRJs, as evidenced by the emphasis on them in our P&T, workload, and faculty qualification policies; each of these policies contains
performance standards and/or expectations in terms of PRJ production. While we recognize wide variations in journal quality, we see the double-blind peer-review process as a foundational element of IC quality. Hence, these two metrics (based on Table 2-1) are basic indicators of the overall high quality of our IC portfolio:

- Total number of PRJs (211)
- Average number of PRJs per participating SA faculty member (5.3)

1) Examples of Scholarly Engagement

- We have significant faculty engagement with Navy and DoD research sponsors. Representative areas for such research include the Acquisition Research Program, the Marine Corps Energy Program, Manpower Analysis, and many others.
- Presented research on gender integration to USMC Talent Management Executive Council comprised of general officers (Bacolod, Seagren)
- Briefed Navy’s Supply Corps senior leadership in January 2020 the results of a series of student capstone projects focused on security risks in managing ships in port (Ferrer)
- Military distance education graduation challenges (Bacolod, Chaudhary, Mehay, Pema)
- Note here the faculty’s editorial board participation?

2) Examples of Scholarly Innovation

- Co-created a “Been There, Done That” series of articles published since 2016 in top acquisition practitioner publication (Mortlock)
- Humanitarian Assistance & Disaster Response (Apte & Yoho 2017)
- Benchmarking contract management process maturity (Rendon 2015)
- Military suicide prevention (Shen, Cunha, Williams) – see below for White House impact
- Instituted faculty research excellence awards to recognize demonstrated research excellence in both disciplinary and defense-focused research
- Employment of machine learning tools in strategic purchasing/category management (Muir)
- Faculty (Rendon, Snider, Wang, Kidalov) active in the emerging field of public procurement

3) Examples of Scholarly Impact

- Annual Acquisition Research Symposium is the only forum for senior leaders, acquisition professionals, and scholars focusing on research in the business of acquisition. In 2019, attendance topped 350 participants, and included 26 panel sessions with 78 submitted papers and presentations from panelists. A student poster session featured 25 student research teams (57 students) presenting their acquisition research results to symposium participants
- Gail Thomas recently (2019) received the University of Southern California Marshall School of Business’s “Business Communication Impact Award” recognizing her 2009 article as the most impactful to the business communication field over the previous five years
- Research on military suicide prevention cited as evidence for White House Executive Order on “Supporting Our Veterans During Their Transition from Uniformed Service to Civilian Life” (Shen, Cunha, Williams)
- Developed a resilience program of explosive ordnance disposal Naval and Marine Corps Reserve communities (Powley)
- Developed a Hurricane Decision Simulator for the US Marine Corps Reserve; finalist in the Manufacturing Service Operations Management Practice Based Research Competition (Regnier)
- Our faculty also contributes to the broader academy, serving as editors of leading disciplinary journals and publishing research with disciplinary impact. The following table shows our ten most highly-cited faculty members, per Web of Science, for the years 2015-2019. See Appendix H for a list of our faculty’s editorial roles.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Items in WOS</th>
<th>Times Cited</th>
<th>Average Cites/Item</th>
<th>H-Index</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shen, Yu-Chu</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cunha, Jesse M</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>6.25</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dew, Nicholas</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>4.73</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sullivan, Ryan S</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DiRenzo, Marco S</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apte, Aruna</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkes, Jeremy</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Augier, Mie</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aten, Kathryn J</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chaudhary Hartmann, Latika</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>4.63</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Participants – Students, Faculty, and Professional Staff

A. Students

Our resident MBA students start classes in January and July each year, and our resident MSM students start classes only in July. Our July cohort is typically larger, approximately 120 students, consistent with the larger summer military move cycles and the MSM student arrivals, while our January cohort is typically smaller, approximately 40 students. Our resident programs are 18-21 months long (MBA = 18 months, MSM = 18-21 months), and our distance programs are typically 24 months, which can also affect the total students on board (enrolled).

Resident students attend classes on a full-time basis, while nonresident students typically take two classes per quarter.

Our average number of students on board, by program, is in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Average students on board</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MBA</td>
<td>190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSM</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMBA</td>
<td>250 (125/year)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS in Contract Management</td>
<td>50 (25/year)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS in Program Management</td>
<td>60 (30/year)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We typically have between 500 and 700 combined resident and distance learning students on board, although these numbers fluctuate based on the larger or smaller cohort arrivals and the graduation
rates of each program. For example, a snapshot from a year ago (November 2018) showed 288 resident students and 389 distance learning students onboard (677 total). A second snapshot in February 2019, after our larger graduation in December and the arrival of the smaller January cohort, showed 214 resident students and 331 distance learning students onboard (545 total). This variation is typical.

The chart below shows our graduation rates for each degree program over the reporting period. In all cases, the average graduation rate for each program over the reporting period (2015-2019) is comparable to our average graduation rates for each program since 2002.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Resident (MBA &amp; MSM)</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMBA (Mil)</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMBA (Civ)</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSCM</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>0% (*)</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSPM</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(*) No cohort scheduled to graduate this year.

Several factors contribute to our high graduation rates for resident students. First, their degree programs are our students’ full-time job. Second, resident students have a specific job awaiting them, and they are aware their future position (and their leaders in that new position) will expect them to demonstrate the new competencies they gain in their degree program. Third, our faculty invests very heavily in our students’ education; we understand that they have important jobs awaiting them, and we work hard to ensure they are ready – on time – to fill those new roles.

Our EMBA students have equally strong graduation rates, with minor differences between the military and civilian students. We attribute this to the potential perception that failure to complete a degree could impact a military officer’s advancement, which could in turn require them to separate from the military. In contrast, civilian students, while possibly facing some promotion consequences if they do not complete their degree, enjoy more security in their existing positions.

Our MSCM and MSPM programs have lower graduation rates. We attribute this to these programs requiring thesis-equivalent projects as a graduation requirement. Nonresident students find it difficult to complete their projects once they have completed their required coursework and have less contact with our faculty. In contrast, the EMBA requires as its capstone requirement a team-based consulting-oriented project as part of a regularly scheduled class, an arrangement that encourages project completion and graduation.

Our student diversity mirrors that of the services, agencies, and nations from which our students come. We cannot recruit students as do other schools; the various military services, other government agencies, and allied nations select students to attend NPS. Beyond societal demographics, other factors beyond our control can influence our diversity. For example, although it did not materially affect enrollment, the government of Turkey abruptly removed all its students from NPS, including from GSDM, between 2018 and 2019, because of political unrest within the country. Because we cannot control the racial and ethnic diversity of our students, we seek to maximize diversity through other means, including how we allocate students from different military services, different military job specialties, and even different military ranks to each student cohort. The table below reports the racial/ethnic distribution of our recent graduates, using the four most recent years from the reporting period for which we have data (2015-2018).
While our students are selected for us, they must meet our admissions requirements. Admissions standards and processes reflect two dimensions: Academic and Professional. GSDM and NPS set academic standards for admissions. The Navy, and other sponsoring agencies, select students—who have met the academic standards—for admission based on professional and career considerations. Thus, admission to GSDM/NPS is accomplished through the joint efforts of the School and students’ sponsors.

The military services determine the number of students selected for our resident curricula each year. In the Navy, a board convenes to establish a quota for students who will be sent for fully-funded education at the Naval Postgraduate School. Navy quotas are based on a complex system designed to balance the Navy’s billets (job positions) requiring advanced education in the various subspecialties with the number of officers, at the appropriate rank, possessing that subspecialty education. This determines the number of officers that will be selected to attend GSDM programs. The Navy then identifies officers interested in a GSDM degree who meet our admission requirements. This student selection and admission process clearly reflects our mission and our close relationship with our program sponsors.

During the earlier years of their career, all Navy officers are screened for graduate study, based on their undergraduate academic performance (officer transcripts may be reviewed by the NPS Admissions Office). In addition to the academic admissions standards, US Navy officers are reviewed for selection to graduate school based on their professional performance and promotion potential. Selection boards and Senior Officer Reviews occur annually to select eligible officers. The selection board evaluates both the officer’s professional performance in the Navy and their prior academic record. Officers selected for graduate study are then offered the opportunity to attend a specific graduate curriculum. No one is ordered to graduate school against his or her will. Similar selection procedures are employed by the other US services and by federal agencies wishing to nominate civilian employees for graduate study.
GSDM and NPS set academic admissions standards. All students enrolled at NPS are assigned an Academic Profile Code (APC) by the NPS registrar’s office. This three-digit code summarizes a student’s prior college performance. Each curriculum has a minimum APC requirement. The APC standard for all of our curricula requires a minimum of a baccalaureate degree with a 2.20 grade-point average; one calculus course for business/social sciences with a C or better, one lower-level calculus course with at least a C-, or two pre-calculus courses with a B+ or better; and no science course requirement. The sponsoring agencies and military career managers then select students meeting the academic standards, based on professional and career considerations. Candidates selected for graduate study are offered the opportunity to attend a specific graduate curriculum, but can choose to decline.

In the case of students from allied nations, the appropriate Academic Associate reviews all individual transcripts and recommends acceptance or rejection; this recommendation is normally the determining factor in the admission decision. International candidates from non-English speaking countries are also required to validate their fluency in English through the Test of English as a Foreign Language (TOEFL). The minimum TOEFL score required is 83 IBT (Internet Based Test) and 560 Written Test.

Student academic support services have continued to improve (see Appendix I for a discussion). Importantly, the Graduate Writing Center (GWC), which was very new at the end of our last reporting period, has now matured, and a reasonable percentage of our students are using it. We believe this is important, because all our students complete a capstone project (e.g., a thesis or an MBA professional report). Over the past 3-years (2017-2019), the GWC reports that 393 of 937 graduates (a stable 42%, ranging from 40%-44% per year) have used its services. These numbers represent only students formally registering for a workshop or individual coaching; they omit drop-in requests, and various online resources. We suspect, but cannot demonstrate, that much of the gap results from our students having access to editorial support through both the Acquisition Research Program and a GSDM contract, which leads students to rely on editors to “clean things up”.

B. Faculty and Professional Staff

Faculty overview: We have 63 full-time faculty members, both tenure-track (36) and non-tenure track (27), allocated to five academic areas. Our tenure-track faculty have terminal degrees from respected schools, while our non-tenure track faculty have extensive military service experience and graduate degrees, including in some cases terminal degrees.

Faculty Recruiting: Recruiting processes are governed by formal GSDM policies for all faculty appointments (tenure track, non-tenure track, and intermittent). (See Appendices J1, J2, J3 for these policies.) In all cases, the Area Chair (AC) for the academic discipline involved coordinates faculty recruiting. The AC appoints a recruiting committee from the area faculty. The committee advertises the position according to the norms for the discipline involved and, consistent with federal human resources requirements, collects resumes and conducts preliminary (phone) interviews. The committee presents their results and recommendations to all area faculty members who vote on the candidates to invite for a campus visit. The Dean approves the candidate slate. Campus visits include interviews with a cross-section of the GSDM faculty, the Dean, and Associate Deans. All faculty members are invited to the candidate’s research presentation, and all Participating faculty members vote whether to approve a candidate. The Dean approves extending an offer to a candidate, based on the faculty feedback and the AC’s recommendation.

Faculty Promotion and Tenure: Our faculty promotion and tenure process is in Appendices K1, K2, and K3. This policy describes a robust mentoring and review process for all tenure track faculty
members from the time they are hired until the start of the tenure review process (a six-year clock in total). All tenure track faculty members have a mentor, of their choice, to support them through this process and ensure their teaching and service assignments are appropriate for an untenured faculty member. The mentor also guides the candidate through a series of collegial reviews by the tenured faculty, including an 18-month “get to know you” review, a formal third-year review, annual reviews thereafter as needed, and the pre-tenure review prior to advancing to candidacy. Candidates successfully completing these reviews proceed to the tenure process.

Tenured Associate Professors are mentored by a Professor within GSDM. They are reviewed by the school’s tenured Professors every three to four years and advised on their progress toward promotion to Professor.

A formal process to determine academic and/or professional qualification has been in place for five years (See Appendix L).

Faculty members with extensive military experience are an integral part of the programs in GSDM. GSDM and NPS consciously employ these experienced military professionals, including both active duty and retired military officers, on a full-time basis to enhance the relevancy of the academic programs. All such faculty have master’s degrees, and in some cases terminal degrees, in their respective areas and have been recognized as accomplished professionals in their fields.

Our military faculty members generally are assigned to NPS for three years. Currently, eight military officers are on the faculty. Military assignments while in GSDM can include teaching courses, advising student projects or theses, and working with civilian faculty on various projects, although a majority of our military officers currently hold administrative or continuing education positions and do not teach in our curricula. For example, our Military Associate Dean and our Program Officer do not teach courses for us, and the military faculty that staff the Human Resources Center of Excellence teach only short courses for the military’s HR community. A few of our military faculty members do teach courses for which they are academically and professionally qualified to teach, and we evaluate their teaching performance just as we do our civilian faculty.

Former senior military personnel also play an important role in the delivery of our programs. At this time, twelve of the non-tenure track faculty members among the participating faculty are retired military.

Our active and retired military faculty participate in numerous phases of our programs, including program development, teaching, defense-focused research, student advising, and assessment.

In addition, all curricula rely on guest speakers, ranging from mid-level analysts to high-ranking senior officers and civilians to bring relevance to the content areas.

GSDM has in the past used relatively few part-time (intermittent, adjunct) faculty. We have begun to recruit and hire more during 2019 in order to provide additional resources and flexibility as our new programs are being developed and deployed.

NPS and GSDM are regulated by and comply with Department of Navy diversity and hiring policies and procedures. GSDM identifies a need for additional faculty for approval by the Provost. GSDM then exercises a school-wide vetting process for candidates, beginning with in-depth reviews by the faculty most closely aligned with the specific recruitment discipline and culminating in a review by all Participating faculty. The faculty’s recommendation is presented to the Dean and then to the Provost for an offer of employment. While we believe this process is relatively similar to other
education institutions, we acknowledge that we experience a few significant differences due to the many laws, executive orders, and regulations that govern federal employment. All of our hiring actions, faculty and staff, comply with the Federal government’s Office of Personnel Management (OPM). Notable differences between our practices and many other education institutions include:

(1) A statutory ceiling on faculty pay, described elsewhere in this report.

(2) Secretary of the Navy directive that, because of the expected influence our faculty have on the nation’s future military leaders, every faculty member must undergo a robust background investigation and adjudication comparable to an investigation approving access to classified data. As a result, we have no practical means of hiring non-US citizens.

(3) A 180-day waiting period constraint on hiring recently retired military officers, or civilian faculty who may have other financial relationships with the federal government.

We coordinate our efforts regarding advertising, interviewing, and hiring with the University’s Human Resources Office to ensure we comply with OPM regulations Equal Opportunity standards. The HR Office also provides training and follow-on guidance regarding effective and appropriate conduct in welcoming applications from a diverse population, reviewing the applications, and providing appropriate responses.

GSDM does not set targets or numerical goals, but we nonetheless have a serious commitment to achieving and maintaining a high level of faculty diversity. Faculty search committees are diverse and inclusive of minority and female members. We believe this is a continuing accomplishment in the School. We have no “second-class citizens.” We recognize, treat, and value our faculty members as faculty; not as “adjunct” or “military” or “tenure track”; not as “junior” or “senior”; and, certainly, not as “minority,” “woman” or “disabled.”

In terms of faculty recruitment and our efforts to support faculty diversity, we often find that the uniqueness of our academic mission, the specializations represented in our academic fields, and our focus on defense-relevance all work against us. In many instances, the types of experience and military-relevant perspective we seek in a faculty member dramatically restrict the total pool of applicants and the possibility of finding a well-qualified diversity hire. For example, we have an almost constant recruiting effort in the Acquisition area. The necessity of a relevant experiential background in the area often means that plausible candidates will come principally from retired military officers or senior defense civilian employees. There are few minorities or women, and almost no disabled candidates, in these fields. While there has been an increasing number of women and minorities among the officer corps of the military, their percentages do not mirror the general public. There are somewhat analogous limitations when seeking faculty candidates in the Transportation and Logistics area, the Manpower area and the Defense Financial Management area. Nonetheless, we encourage all “diversity candidates” in these specialized fields, using our current faculty member’s contacts and taking advantage of the fact that the communities from which qualified candidates derive are small and usually well-known to our senior faculty in these fields.

The following table summarizes our full-time faculty demographics by gender and ethnicity.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Other/Not Reported</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American Indian/Alaskan Native</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black/African American</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

After accounting for the number of former military serving as non-tenure track/practitioner faculty, which heavily skews white/male given the era they served on active duty, we believe our faculty diversity is solid.

Our administrative staff, reporting to the Associate Dean (Administration) includes an Administrative Officer and staff, responsible for day-to-day financial management, travel, and other administrative duties; a faculty associate for accreditation and assessment; and a faculty associate for instructional technology (a new position this reporting period). The administrative officer and staff are civilians hired as GS (General Service) employees, which is the typical hiring structure for most government employees. The faculty associates are appointed under Schedule A of the Excepted Service. In all cases they are full-time government employees. We actively support their development and have seen several of our employees receive promotions outside GSDM and within NPS.

C. Organization

Our academic structure supports our mission (Appendix M shows our organization chart.). Alongside the traditional academic model of a Dean, Associate Deans for Research, Instruction, and Administration, we also have a Military Associate Dean (MAD), and a Program Officer. The MAD is an active duty Navy Captain assigned to oversee the GSDM military faculty and students, advise the Dean and faculty on military matters, and provide connections to the operational Navy. The Program Officer is an active duty officer (typically at the Commander/LT Colonel rank) with administrative responsibilities for GSDM’s curricula, overseeing student administration and coordinating the school’s biennial curriculum review process.

We have Area Chairs for each of the five disciplinary faculty groups: Financial Management; Acquisition; Operations and Logistics, Manpower and Economics, and Organizations/Management. Area Chairs are responsible for the faculty and courses in their respective areas. They serve as raters for the faculty in the DoD’s performance appraisal system, and they coordinate individual faculty work plans and teaching schedules.

Additionally, each curriculum has an assigned Academic Associate (AA), who manages curricular matters, including students in the curriculum. The AAs coordinate modifications to the degree concentrations, through the biennial curriculum review process. The AAs help ensure Navy requirements are linked to GSDM’s academic competencies.
5. Learning and Teaching

In this section we review the development and management of our GDSM curricula. We provide an overview of our curricula, discuss the major curriculum changes we’ve made in the reporting period, review how we updated our assurance of student learning program and how we use it to ensure our students are progressing toward our desired learning outcomes (we call them *competencies*), and discuss how we support continuous improvement of our teaching.

A. Overview of Curricula

NPS engages with our curriculum sponsors, the leaders of military commands that send students to attend the programs, to create degree programs and curricula in response to educational needs the sponsors identify. Each curriculum sponsor’s needs are reflected in a set of Educational Skills Requirements (ESRs) that are agreed upon between the sponsor and NPS, and which serve as the basis for educational objectives in the curriculum. This helps to ensure that GSDM curricula are focused on preparing military officers and defense civilians for effective service in designated defense management and policy areas.

All GSDM curricula have three main program components:

- A common core of courses intended to provide a broad, multidisciplinary foundation of subjects that underlie effective management in public organizations, such as process analysis, budgeting, economics, and organizational behavior
- A curricular specialization in a designated functional area of defense management, such as acquisition, financial, human resource, or logistics management; this specialization aligns with ESRs identified by the curriculum sponsor.
- A capstone project. NPS policy requires all students to prepare masters theses or applications projects designed to demonstrate their abilities to analyze issues and problems pertinent to their academic programs and their professional careers.

Our faculty as a whole has authority and responsibility for the core component of each degree program. The specialization component of each degree program is the responsibility of the faculty members in each respective specialty area, with input provided by curriculum sponsors via the biennial curriculum review process.

Each numbered specialty curriculum has a designated faculty member who serves as its Academic Associate (AA). The AA manages the curriculum’s delivery, serves as the principal academic advisor for students in the curriculum, and serves as the primary liaison with the curriculum sponsor. The AA ensures alignment of specialty courses to satisfy degree requirements and educational skill requirements as agreed upon with the sponsor.

Each course has a designated Course Coordinator, who works to ensure consistent and effective delivery of courses to satisfy curriculum requirements.

The Faculty Instruction Committee (FIC) is a standing GSDM committee that exercises faculty governance in instructional matters. The FIC reviews changes to programs and courses, reviews and makes recommendations on new programs and courses, approves/resolves minor changes/issues, and frames major changes/issues for decision and resolution for the faculty as a whole.

The NPS Academic Council has representatives from each academic unit on campus and exercises curriculum governance at the university level.
1) Resident Programs

The MBA and the MS in Management (MSM) are the foundational “flagships” of our educational product line. Classes are delivered only via face-to-face instruction on a full-time, year-round basis. The figure below shows a representative residential course of study, prior to our core revision. In the figure, blue cells are core MBA courses, with green cells representing core courses unique to the MBA, and purple cells representing core courses unique to the MSM. We note that our core courses have a strong defense focus, including formal courses in defense acquisition, defense budgeting, and defense resource analysis, with other courses including defense-related examples. Because the DoD focuses heavily on acquiring products and services, rather than marketing our services to customers, our core includes the acquisition course in place of marketing. Orange cells are populated by courses unique to the student’s subspeciality (e.g., acquisition, finance, logistics), and red cells represent time to focus on the student’s capstone project. The number, e.g., (4-0) represent credit hours using a (class-lab) format. The different colored text in each cell represents the extent to which the courses contain defense-specific content. Unstated in this representative matrix is that many of our students also take alongside their master’s degree coursework a sequence of four Joint Professional Military Education (JPME) courses, offered through the Naval War College’s satellite office at NPS, and necessary for their career advancement. These courses add 16 credit hours to the students’ matrix of courses, but in general do not count toward graduation. (Our new Professional MBA excludes the specialization courses.)

Representative Resident Core Matrix Before Core Revision

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summer/Winter</th>
<th>GB3010 (4-0) Managing for Organizational Effectiveness</th>
<th>GB3050 (4-0) Financial Reporting &amp; Analysis</th>
<th>GB3070 (4-0) Economics of Global Defense Environment</th>
<th>GB3014 (1-0) Ethics for Public Managers</th>
<th>GB1000 (0-3) Quantitative Skills for Grad Mgmt. Studies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall/Spring</td>
<td>GB3040 (4-0) Managerial Statistics</td>
<td>GB3051 (3-0) Cost Management</td>
<td>GB4071 (4-0) Economic Analysis &amp; Def. Resource Allocation</td>
<td>GB4052 (3-0) Managerial Finance</td>
<td>MN2039 (4-0) Basic Quantitative Methods in Econ Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer/Winter</td>
<td>GB3012 (3-0) Communication for Managers</td>
<td>GB4053 (4-0) Defense Budget Policy &amp; Fin. Mgt. Systems</td>
<td>GB4043 (3-0) Business Modeling Analysis</td>
<td>GB4042 (4-0) Operations Management</td>
<td>MN4110 (4-0) Multivariable Manpower Data Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall/Spring</td>
<td>GB4014 (4-0) Strategic Management</td>
<td>MN3301 (4-0) Systems Acquisition</td>
<td></td>
<td>MBA and MSM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer/Winter</td>
<td>MBA Project MS Thesis</td>
<td>Specialization Courses</td>
<td></td>
<td>MBA Only</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall/Spring</td>
<td>MBA Project MS Thesis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MSM Only</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6 The DoD’s recruiting efforts certainly include marketing, but the military services generally contract for marketing efforts, whereas many of our graduates will hold jobs directly in the acquisition career field, thus our emphasis.
Within this resident curriculum, we offer ten subspecialty curricula within the MBA and two subspecialty curricula within the MSM.

**Defense-Focused MBA Program (10 curricula)**

*Logistics Curricula*
- Transportation Management (814)
- Supply Chain Management (819)
- Material Logistics Support Management (827)

*Acquisition Curricula*
- Acquisition and Contract Management (815)
- Systems Acquisitions Management (816)

*Financial Management Curricula*
- Financial Management (837)
- Financial Management – Energy (838)

*International Curricula*[^7]
- Defense Systems Management International (818)
- Resource Planning and Management for International Defense (820)

*Information Systems Management (870)*

*Defense Business Management (809)*[^8]

**MSM Program (2 curricula)**
- Manpower Systems Analysis (847)
- Defense Systems Analysis (817)

2) **Nonresident Distributed/Distance Learning Programs**

Students in these programs attend classes on a part-time basis, via synchronous on-line instruction (e.g., Zoom, Collaborate).

**EMBA Program (2 curricula)**
- EMBA (805)
- Civilian EMBA (807)

**Specialized MS Degree Program (2 curricula)**
- MSCM (835)
- MSPM (836)

[^7]: These two interdisciplinary curricula are available only to international students attending NPS under arrangements managed by the Defense Security Cooperation Agency and the Navy International Programs Office in Washington, DC. Because these curricula have no sponsors, and because students take no courses that are unique to these curricula, they are not addressed in the remainder of this report.

[^8]: The 809 curriculum was established to provide NPS staff civilians with the opportunity to pursue an MBA. Students may enroll in the curriculum with the permission of their supervisors, and they take courses on a part-time, space-available basis. 809 curriculum students take the standard MBA core courses and complete a capstone project, but they have no required sequence of specialization courses; they may take any available specialization courses that comport with overall MBA requirements. Thus, the curriculum has neither a sponsor nor ESRs, and because it requires no unique administration, it is not addressed in the remainder of this report.
3) Student Graduates

The following table shows our graduates by program from 2015-2019. For comparison, the number of graduates is slightly lower this reporting period than in the last reporting period, with the difference being almost exclusively fewer EMBA graduations. Specifically, the five-year average annual number of graduates for the MBA, MSM, MSCM and MSPM programs are all within 3 students between the two reporting periods; the five-year average number of graduates for the EMBA fell from 132 to 96.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MBA Res</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSM Res</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMBA</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSCM</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSPM</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


We made many changes to our curricula outside of our assurance of learning program. Generally, these changes were driven by strategic considerations such as Navy guidance and our NPS and GSDM strategic plans. In this section we discuss four major curriculum changes we made during this reporting period and summarize many others in tabular format. We address changes stemming from our assurance of learning program later in this report.

1) Revised Resident Core Curriculum

We reviewed and revised our core residential curriculum for several reasons. First, we hadn’t reviewed our curriculum in approximately 13 years, and were concerned we might not be current with trends in business education. Second, we had concerns that our students – taking 100+/- hours in 6 quarters – were overloaded. Third, the Navy directed that its students take a required course on cyber issues, which would add hours to our students’ heavily loaded curricula. Fourth, we wanted to give our students flexibility to tailor their education to their desired interested and career paths, by taking electives or certificate sequences of courses; the current matrix made that essentially impossible. Finally, budget constraints and a potential full-time equivalent staffing ceiling concerned us at the time, though the staffing ceiling has been relaxed.

Through a series of faculty retreats, focus groups, committee efforts, and faculty meetings, we reviewed our curriculum against peer and aspirant schools, surveyed graduates, studied our sponsor ESRs, and ultimately arrived at a solution to reduce our core curriculum by eliminating three courses and combining four others into two. (We also increased our Ethics course to 4 credits, 3 class hours and 2 lab hours.) We eliminated Managerial Communications, Business Modeling, and Managerial Finance completely from the core (although subspecialties are able to keep them as needed), reduced our Economics and Economic Analysis courses into a single course, and reduced our Financial Reporting and Cost Management Courses into a single course. The following figure shows the resulting resident matrix. A major result of this change is that it provided room for students to begin the specialty courses much earlier in the academic program, which addressed an unstated but important need in exposing them to problems and
content that might inform their capstone research projects. (Note the orange cells in the figure, representing specialty courses, extend all the way to the first quarter, where they had previously started in the fourth quarter. Note also that this matrix explicitly acknowledges the need for many of our students to take JPME courses alongside their degree program.)

Representative Resident Core Matrix After Core Revision

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summer/Winter</th>
<th>GB3010 (4-0) Managing for Organizational Effectiveness</th>
<th>GB3156 (4-0) Financial &amp; Managerial Accounting</th>
<th>GB3070 (4-0) Introduction to Cost Benefit Analysis</th>
<th>GB1000 (0-3) Quantitative Skills for Grad Mgt. Studies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall/Spring</td>
<td>GB4011 (4-0) Ethical Leadership in Public Org.</td>
<td>GB/MN3040 (4-0) Managerial Statistics</td>
<td>MN2039 (4-0) Basic Quantitative Methods in Econ Analysis</td>
<td>Defense Examples</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Defense Content</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Defense Unique</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer/Winter</td>
<td>GB3042 (4-0) Process Analytics</td>
<td>GB4053 (4-0) Defense Budget Policy &amp; Fin. Mgt. Systems</td>
<td>MN4110 (4-1) Multivariable Manpower Data Analysis</td>
<td>Specialization Courses or JPME/Cyber</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall/Spring</td>
<td>GB4014 (4-0) Strategic Management</td>
<td>MN3301 (4-0) Systems Acquisition</td>
<td></td>
<td>MBA and MSM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GSDM Certificates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MBA Only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer/Winter</td>
<td>MBA Project MS Thesis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MSM Only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall/Spring</td>
<td>MBA Project MS Thesis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2) “Stackable” Distance Learning Certificate and Degree Programs

In concert with our strategy to expand our programs to underserved communities, we developed “stackable” certificate and degree programs. A significant population of the Navy and DoD workforce – primarily civilian workers – is unable and/or unwilling to relocate to Monterey for 18 months; additionally, in line with trends in higher education, these workers might not need a degree at one time, but instead might need targeted education in the form of one or a few courses, that over time might comprise a degree. Stackable distance learning certificate programs allow us to meet these needs in this underserved populations.

Based on conversations with sponsors and contacts in the fleet, we developed a series of these certificates, typically three or four courses, with more (e.g., Basic Contract Management and Advanced Contract Management) on the way:

- Principles of Analytical Management
- Acquisition Logistics
- Strategic Leadership
- Leadership for Public Administrators
- Advanced Acquisition Studies
- Managerial Logistics
- Cost-Benefit Analysis and Program Evaluation
In line with the Navy's guidance that (at least) one year of resident graduate education is now required as a precondition to assuming major command – a desirable career milestone – we developed a one-year Professional MBA degree to meet the needs of officers who can afford only one year away from the fleet. This degree program does not afford students depth of education in one of our full MBA subspecialties, instead focusing on a broader, more general MBA body of knowledge combined with the possibility of adding a certificate sequence of courses within GSDM or another school on campus to provide some customization; for example, it offers an international variant, with students adding a few courses through the School for International Graduate Studies, sufficient to earn a certification in National Security Affairs. We believe this degree will also attract students who might otherwise see a part-time MBA from a competitor. Organizations from around the DoD and the Federal Government, ranging from various Army commands, to Strategic Command, to the FBI have expressed interest in the degree. This program is new, and we have no experience to report at this time.
The following table summarizes changes we made exclusively or primarily outside of our assessment of student learning program.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AY</th>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Change</th>
<th>Motivating Factors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 2015 | 817- Defense System Analysis  | • Added GB1000 Quantitative Skills for Graduate Management Studies.  
• Revision of following elective courses: Recommended: GE3510, GB4530, AO4801 and SE3100 Optional: advanced methods OS4011, OA3304.  
• GB3010 and GB3012 reviewed not substantially altered. | Sponsor’s recommendations; GSDM leadership                                                                 |
| 2015 | All MBA/MSM                   | • GB3020 Eliminated from core. No longer contributed to program objectives.  
• GB1000—Math Refresher utilized “Aleks” an online platform that trains students’ in basic mathematical skills. | GSDM leadership                                                                                               |
| 2017 | 847-Manpower System Analysis | Moved MN4761 from spring quarter to summer quarter  
• Move MN2112 from 5th to 4th quarter to provide early exposure to thesis topics and process | Sponsor reviews; GSDM Leadership                                                                             |
| 2017 | All MBA/MSM                   | GB1000—Math Refresher utilized “Aleks” an online platform that trains students’ in basic mathematical skills. | GSDM faculty                                                                                                  |
| 2018 | 817-Defense Systems Analysis | Increased program quarters from 6 to 7 (21 months program).  
• Sponsor request to provide more time for students' theses; | Sponsor; GSDM leadership; Direct Assessment results;                                                          |
| 2019 | All MBA/MSM                   | Reduce core courses from 13 to 9 courses                                                                                               | Sponsor reviews, student feedback, GSDM leadership (more white-space for student-officers to “think.”). See discussion above. |
| 2019 | 837-838-Financial Management  | FM Substitute GB3050 and GB3051 for GB3056; Added GB3012 to specialty curriculum                                                          | FM faculty                                                                                                     |
| 2019 | 817-Defense System Analysis  | Add GB4044                                                                                                                                | Sponsor request to improve students' communications and research skill                                        |
| 2019 | 814-819-827                  | GB4043 removed from core; added to curriculum specialty                                                                                   | GSDM leadership                                                                                               |
| 2019 | MBA core                      | Eliminated GB4043 and GB4071 from core; added to specialty curricula 817 and 847.                                                        | GSDM leadership                                                                                               |
| 2019 | MBA-MSM Core                  | Developed new Ethics course GB4011                                                                                                       | Sponsor; GSDM Leadership; Direct Assessment results;                                                          |
| 2019 | 870-Information Management   | Resequencing of prerequisites for IS4300.                                                                                               | GSDM Leadership; Direct Assessment results                                                                   |
C. Assessment of Student Learning

GSDM uses course-embedded direct assessments of student learning. This section describes our assessment program and its evolution during 2015–2019. Appendix N provides a comprehensive overview of our assessment program, including goals, curriculum maps, forms, and other details. Appendix O is our current Program Assessment Policy.

1) Program Evolution

GSDM Assessment of Student Learning, 2015–2017. Our direct assessment program during these years follows the AOL process and course-level assessments we established in 2013–2014. Under that policy, degree program goals were referred to as “competencies”, with their wording aligned more closely with NASPAA’s standards to simplify our assessments. We assessed the courses’ mandatory objectives (those that must be taught in all sections, regardless of the instructors who teach the sections) that support each of our programs’ competencies. This resulted in a set of well-defined course level assessments.

GSDM Assessment of Student Learning, 2018–2019. In Spring 2017, after a periodic analysis of our AoL process, we decided to refine the competencies of all of our programs. During this process of revision, all direct assessments were suspended. Furthermore, in July 2017, a majority of our faculty participated in an Assessment of Student Learning seminar conducted by Dr. Karen Ann Tarnoff at NPS. Dr. Tarnoff’s visit and expertise provided guidance and a framework for improving our AoL process, allowing our AOL Program to mature from arguably more course-level assessment, to true program level assessment. GSDM faculty groups reviewed and revised our resident and non-resident program competencies; we also added program objectives for each of the competencies in the programs. Direct assessment of our revised program competencies and objectives resumed in Winter AY2018.

In addition to revising program competencies and defining program objectives, GSDM faculty developed assessment rubrics for each competency. Volunteers from the larger faculty body split into 5 sub-committees to develop rubrics for each of the five core MBA/MSM competencies. Meanwhile each academic area was responsible for developing rubrics to assess the program competency for the specialty programs it offers.

Under our prior AOL system, instructors would individually create their own rubric to assess a specific program’s competency. The new official rubrics developed by the faculty body improves the efficiency and consistency of the assessment process; rubrics have been developed by consensus, creating uniformity and clarity in standards and achievement criteria when assessing GSDM’s students’ performance. Examples of developed official rubrics are shown in Appendix N.

In addition to rubrics, we developed an Assessment Result Form (ARF) to aggregate the results from each dimension of the rubric and summarizes the results of the assessment. An example of the ARF is shown in Appendix N.

2) Direct Assessment: Improvements from Earlier AOL Iteration

While not a perfect process, we did benefit from our earlier AoL iteration. Here we discuss three examples of improvements resulting from course-embedded direct assessments (see Appendix N for other examples and complete assessment results):
• New course development—GB4011: Ethical Leadership in Public Organizations. Several assessments in the “Ethics” competency suggested the need to give students more opportunity to learn and practice applying ethical principles, something that required the course to be longer, namely a regular four-credit course compared to the one-hour credit adopted. Additionally, a four-credit course would send a stronger signal to students on the importance of Ethics in the GSDM curriculum. Another important consideration was the opportunity to integrate leadership with ethics—very much emphasized by the Navy—especially after some recent scandals. To this end, the Financial Management faculty group decided to incorporate recent ethics-related articles from the Wall Street Journal and other popular press outlets to give students awareness of ethical issues commonly found in financial management.

• Revision of the Resource Management rubric. The results of direct assessment in this core competency indicated an overlapping of the rubric’s dimensions with those of the Critical Thinking and the Problem-Solving rubrics making it difficult to assess the skill of students to operate according to the specific concepts of resource management. Faculty revised the rubric to better reflect the dimensions necessary to assess students’ resource management skills. Current assessments (Fall AY2020) will provide stronger and clearer data on this students’ competency.

• A series of assessments, especially in the past few years, have highlighted some student’s issues in Critical Thinking. To improve our educational capability in this area, we sent a faculty member (Augier) to a Critical Thinking workshop. Since then, faculty has reviewed the previous competency and students’ critical thinking skill is now assessed in a specific Critical Thinking program competency. Also, direct assessment of GB3010—Managing for Organizational Effectiveness—revealed the possibility of adjusting course learning objectives to better highlight Critical Thinking. The Management group faculty are introducing the reviewed objectives in the next offering of GB3010—Winter 2020.

3) Direct Assessment: Improvements from Current AOL Process

The following table illustrates our direct assessment process for each competency, showing the quarters and courses in which we assessed that competency, the results of the assessment, and the loop closing process over time for that competency. We illustrate the process using our resident MBA program; the results for other programs are in Appendix N.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Competencies &amp; Objectives</th>
<th>Quarter &amp; Course</th>
<th>Assessment Results</th>
<th>Loop Closing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Our graduates will be:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1: Effective defense managers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Spring 2015</strong></td>
<td>The material we deal with in the class is complex (strategy is a complex topic) so I expect that a limited number of students will actually exceed expectations.</td>
<td>There are no actions per se stemming from this assessment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GB4014: Strategic Management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Spring 2016</strong></td>
<td>Only 3% of students did not correctly calculate NOI and AOA from Financial Statements provided. One possible explanation for the favorable result is that the concept of ROI is taught in the prerequisite course, GB3050.</td>
<td>No further action necessary at this time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GB3051: Cost Management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Fall 2017</strong></td>
<td>Uniformly positive results in the first two dimension of the rubric. Students had some problems with the third dimension: Resource Allocation/Budgeting. Usage of resource-related terms (3%) well below the unacceptable mark established by faculty.</td>
<td>Devote additional time for discussion and/or drills in interpreting budgetary data. Require students to use budget justification materials (i.e., R- and P-forms) for this report. No changes to curricula. Most students will have follow-on courses that will reinforce budget-related terminology.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MN3301: Acquisition of Defense Systems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Fall 2017</strong></td>
<td>This assessment followed-up on the spring 2015 course assessment. New DoD-specific case material was developed. Instructors included case materials on Net Assessment and the RAND organization, video cases on the Fog of War (Robert McNamara) and ARGO, and a teaching note on strategy and inertia. From informal student feedback the new material was well received.</td>
<td>No further action necessary at this time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GB4014: Strategic Management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Fall 2017</strong></td>
<td>A vast majority of the students understood the role of statistics in the question; however, relatively few recognized that a better technique existed and would give a qualitatively different result.</td>
<td>Increase focus on the range of available tools and the implications from their use, particularly with respect to homework problems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MN3040: Data Management and Statistics for Manpower Analysis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Winter 2017</strong></td>
<td>Students generally did poorly in both related questions.</td>
<td>Articles that apply the main concepts will be shared and made available to all future instructors. Partial flip of the classroom. Assign readings to students and devote more class time to problems and applications of the material read.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GB3070: Economics of the Global Defense Environment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section</td>
<td>Course Code</td>
<td>Course Title</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2: Effective participants in DoD policy processes.</td>
<td>Winter 2015 - GB4043: Business Modeling and Analysis</td>
<td>Students had problems in correctly identifying the Linear Programming (LP) allocation problem presented in word problem. The issues and findings relate to the analytical abilities of the students to identify decisions.</td>
<td>Introduce more examples of applications of various areas such as logistics, financial management, acquisition management and economics.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fall 2017-GB4071: Economic Analysis &amp; Defense Resource Allocation</td>
<td>Students limited ability to apply the economic concepts and principles in more complicated and out-of-the-box problem. After devoting more class time to practicing these applied problems, in subsequent exams students performed much better. Students just needed more practice applying these concepts to real-world problems.</td>
<td>Incorporate more real-life concepts and practical CBAs to review in class in future offerings of this course.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Winter 2017-GB4043: Business Modeling and Analysis</td>
<td>Findings revealed some issues with the analytical abilities of the students to identify decisions to be made in a given situation to achieve the objective described within the constraints.</td>
<td>Introduce more examples of applications of various areas such as logistics, financial management, acquisition management and economics.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Winter 2017-GB3042: Operations Management</td>
<td>Students did not meet our expectations for calculating resource capacity (in part a function of a reasonably complicated problem).</td>
<td>Need to document where each resource contributes to each process activity earlier in the course.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3: Effective Problem solvers.</td>
<td>Spring 2015-GB3040: Managerial Statistics</td>
<td>Some students struggled with communicating the information to a lay audience, and as a whole were not able to describe any limitations to the analysis.</td>
<td>Introduce a new textbook, in Fall 2016 which explicitly emphasizes what the results of an analysis mean, including communicating results and describing limitations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Summer 2016-GB3010: Managing for Organizational Behavior</td>
<td>Follow-up on 2 actions stemmed from assessment 2014. 1) Students conduct two case analyses in the very first two class sessions. 2) Instructors use a number of case studies in class where students prepare outlines. Additionally, they are also required to provide a written paper for which they are advised to see the writing center, and to submit preliminary work to the instructor for feedback at any time throughout the course.</td>
<td>Further action to take are: Assign group work earlier in the course so that the students can learn team-based problem solving and receive instructor feedback earlier in the course. Introduce more case studies in the course in order to simulate real-world management situations in diagnosing and assessing. Evaluate topic areas covered in the course to reduce their number (if possible) while focus on priority topics in more depth during the course.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2017-MN2039: Basic Quantitative Methods in Economic Analysis</td>
<td>Students failed to translate the economic problem into mathematical terms. Also, they could not identify the proper approach to solve the problem, and also could not find and use the solution to the problem for interpretation back into economic terms. A significant number of this cohort had no prior calculus experience making it very difficult to even get to this point.</td>
<td>Recommend students to review and practice algebraic skills in GB1000 (working with fractions and exponents, factoring equations, properties of exponential and logarithmic functions, solving for x and y in a linear system of equations).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2016-GB4052: Managerial Finance</td>
<td>10% of the students did not meet expectations in two of the three traits that were assessed. This course includes more breadth and depth than other courses. Also, many of those concepts are mathematically more difficult and require more involvement.</td>
<td>Long-term improvement: when end-strength issues are resolved, we may consider offering the advanced finance class in FM subspecialty to make the class less dense in terms of content, thus help improve student learning. Short-term improvement: increase algebra skills of the students.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4: Responsible public servants.</td>
<td>In conclusion, most students are doing well given the technical nature of the course. No further action necessary at this time.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winter 2016-GB3014: Ethics for Public Managers</td>
<td>Difference between students’ ability to identify ethical issues and connect ethical problems to public management compared to students’ ability to correctly apply ethical principles to the problems they confront. The 2014 assessment, revealed that smaller class sizes would allow more time for individual students. The 2016 classes averaged 18 students each, which helps address this class size issue</td>
<td>GSDM is currently conducting a review of its MBA ethics offering, in order to adopt a 2-0 course. If this course is adopted it should provide students more opportunity to practice using case studies in their sub-specialty area. A 2-0 course would also require an applied ethics paper at the end of the course. Another action is to try the use of pop quizzes in the course to test students’ knowledge of basic definitions.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winter 2017-GB4053: Defense Budget and FM Policy</td>
<td>The number of students “failing to meet expectations” (ranging from seven to nine students across the three traits) exceeds the desired level. The errors seemed to result from not critically reading the assignment. Need more exposure to critical writing, perhaps in the first two quarters of the program.</td>
<td>Networking with communications faculty course that is taught concurrently with GB4053, to reinforce critical thinking skills. Instructors will discuss course linkages to build on the lessons from Quarter 3 when teaching GB4510 in Quarter 4. 2. Instructor will bring back a “preview” case exercise to demonstrate the effective analysis of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
a fact pattern. Next, he will use the Socratic Method to reinforce the lessons using a different case. Finally, he will provide a third case and ask students to demonstrate the analytical skills developed in the first two cases.

| 5: Able to interact effectively with a diverse defense workforce. | Summer 2016-GB3012: Communications for Managers | Two students out of fifteen total did not meet expectations for one of 2 elements graded in the assessment (approx. 6%). Comments from the instructor are:
1. Instructor observed tension between prescribed DoD language norms and what communication research prescribes in order to achieve high impact writing.
2. The instructor also highlights that a reduced number of credit hours for 3rd quarter students may help learning. | No major issues from this assessment. There are no immediate actions stemming from this assessment. |

| 6: Effective overseers of industry participation in defense management. | Spring 2016-GB4052: Managerial Finance | With regard to the 2014 closing the loop summary, some students were not proficient with Excel. During the current assessment, Dr. Menichini determined more students are proficient with Excel than in previous years. At this time Dr. Menichini observed students’ difficulty with the complexity involved in preparing the timeline for cash flows. | Assign more exercises dealing with complex cases having multiple parts to strengthen student performance. |

4) Indirect Assessments

Our indirect assessment suite includes curricula reviews, student feedback sessions, student opinion forms for each course offering, capstone project assessments, entrance and exit surveys for graduates, and alumni surveys.

**Curriculum Reviews:** Of particular importance are the biennial curricula reviews, which are required by NPS directive to promote continuous improvement in each specialty curriculum. Far beyond typical employer surveys, these reviews are conducted by designated sponsors, who are typically senior government leaders (flag-level military officers or Senior Executive Service civilians) for which we designed our programs and to which our graduates will be assigned following graduation. Sponsors visit NPS every other year to meet with faculty and the administration to review and assess their curricula against the core educational skill requirements that the sponsor believes our graduates need for success in their future jobs. The outcomes of these sponsor-faculty collaborations are course- and program-level recommendations for improvements. To illustrate, in the latest review of the Manpower Systems Analysis curriculum, discussions with the sponsor (from the office of the Chief of Naval Personnel) highlighted low students “on-time” graduation rates. The issue was addressed by resequencing curriculum courses and changing timing of offering (e.g. moving MN4761 to be taught in Summer instead of Spring quarter), which allowed students to identify courses earlier, to engage their thesis research sooner, and to increase the “on-time” graduation rates. (Appendices P1 and P2 provide examples of curriculum review documents. Appendix Q is an example of detailed program sponsor feedback.)
A list of curriculum reviews conducted during the report period is shown in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>805/807</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>814</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>815/835</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>816/836</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>817</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>818/820</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>819</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>827</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>837/838</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>847</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>870</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>2021</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Surveys:** Another example of our use of indirect assessment processes is the administration of entrance surveys to incoming students and exit surveys to graduating students. In these surveys, we ask students to rate their knowledge, skills, and abilities in each of their degree program competencies. Comparing entrance and exit survey results will provide us with additional evidence upon which to base curriculum improvements.

In the past five years we have revised our students’ entrance and exit surveys several times with the intent to refine and improve both survey’s questions and scales. Due to these changes we could not gather a substantial amount of data to measure the students’ acquired skills before and after graduation. So far, we have survey data from a cohort of incoming MBA students (January 2018) who graduated in the past Spring quarter (June 2019). The chart below shows the entrance and exit questions asked to the students at the beginning and at the end of their MBA program.
As we expected, and hoped, the results show higher scores for graduates than for incoming students. As we gather more data with these surveys, we will be able to develop meaningful goals (e.g., on average, how much competency improvement do we seek?) and interpretations of survey results. We have also extended this initiative to our DL degree programs.

A recent initiative in our indirect assessment processes is the review of NPS thesis/capstone data gathered at institutional level by the NPS Institutional Research department. Within NPS, all departments and programs conduct formal capstone assessments for the purpose of assessing program learning outcomes and initiating program improvement. NPS employs a set of program outcomes that are broadly similar across all NPS’ master’s degree programs. The thesis/capstone assessment is filled out when faculty members approve the thesis or final project report and represents an opportunity to comment on the degree to which students demonstrate achievement of learning objectives set for their programs. GSDM performs internal analysis of the assessment results from NPS thesis/capstone by curricula and by residents and non-resident programs for six out of the eight competencies assessed at institutional level. Results are also compared with other direct and indirect assessment results and possible discrepancies discussed and addressed at faculty level.
**NPS thesis/capstone competencies:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Competency</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subject Matter Competence:</td>
<td>Student(s) demonstrates graduate-level knowledge and competencies in the/their academic field.</td>
<td>GSDM does not assess this competency; however, it is assessed at institutional level.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Methods and Technical Merit:</td>
<td>Student(s) demonstrates the ability to apply technical expertise and appropriate methodological rigor in conducting research and analysis.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical Thinking:</td>
<td>Student(s) demonstrates the ability to apply critical thinking and logical reasoning to research questions and to implement creative or innovative approaches to answer them.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written Communication:</td>
<td>Student(s) demonstrates proficiency in communicating and presenting the written results of the/their inquiry in a thesis or final project report appropriate to the/their academic program.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral Communication (optional):</td>
<td>Student(s) demonstrates proficiency in communicating and presenting the results of the/their inquiry in a thesis or final project report in an oral presentation. (Note: this dimension is optional – complete if it applies to your curriculum or department.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defense Relevance:</td>
<td>The thesis or final project addresses a problem of relevance in the defense or national security community.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevance to Curriculum:</td>
<td>The thesis or final project is closely aligned with the student’s assigned curriculum.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Potential for Publication</strong></td>
<td>GSDM does not assess this competency; however, it is assessed at institutional level.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following chart shows the results of this assessment.

![Chart showing assessment results](chart.png)

5-pt Likert Scale used:
5=Advanced; 4=Nearing Advanced; 3=Proficient; 2=Nearing Proficient; 1=Acceptable (competencies 1-4)
5=Fully Relevant; 4=Highly Relevant; 3=Relevant; 2=Minimally Relevant; 1=Not Relevant (competencies 5-6)
Results show that overall average scores across GSDM remain in the “proficiency” range for both the resident students (3.8) and non-resident students (3.7) during the past 5 years.

*Defense Relevance and Relevance to Curriculum* highlight the highest scores for both resident (4.2 and 4.1) and non-resident programs (4.2 and 4.3) among the competencies indicating that student thesis/Capstone projects are very relevant to defense and to their curriculum.

The Curriculum dimension reflects the students’ ability to apply their skills and knowledge to a problem that relates directly to their curriculum. The Defense dimension reflects the students’ ability to address a problem of relevance to the defense or national security community.

The higher learning outcomes scores in GSDM were Critical Thinking (3.8) Subject Matter Competency (3.8) and Writing—Communications (3.8) for the resident students; Critical Thinking (3.9) and Writing—Communications (3.7) for the non-resident students.

**D. Continuous Improvement of Teaching**

We constantly seek to improve our teaching. This section describes a few key initiatives using both NPS and GSDM resources.

1) **NPS resources**

   NPS has a Teaching and Learning Commons, which serves as an umbrella organization that integrates a variety of NPS educational support offices and supports and funds innovative teaching initiatives across campus with mini-grants. These grants can even extend to students. Two of our faculty (Tick, Ballard) supported one of our students in applying for a mini-grant to try screen mirroring software for his classes, when a serious medical issue required his wife was admitted for a lengthy hospital intensive care stay. The software allowed him to follow courses from the hospital, and submit assignments all through a tablet app. The faculty members and student also collaborated on recording extra tutorials for difficult concepts that are now available on the instructor course sites.

   NPS also offers funding to recapitalize laboratories. While STEM labs are the obvious beneficiaries, GSDM maintains its own computer laboratories and needs to recapitalize the computers and software regularly.

   NPS has an ongoing initiative to develop the “Classroom of the Future”, to which we are providing inputs.

   NPS has fully-mature support offices, including the Center for Educational Design, Development, and Distribution, which provides instructional design and media development services, and the Office of Teaching and Learning, which supports faculty across all the stages of their academic careers through programs and services ranging from short courses and roundtable book discussions open to all faculty members to individual consultations and coaching of faculty members.

2) **New Instructional Design/Instructional Technology Director**

   We recently hired a new Instructional Design/Instructional Technology Director to provide direct support for GSDM faculty, supplementing and complementing the resources available
through NPS. We now have regular brown-bag sessions to illustrate new ways in which Instructional Technology, both existing and new tools, can support us in the classroom.

3) New EMBA Teaching Award

Developed a new teaching award for our EMBA program to complement the Liskin award, which recognizes the outstanding resident program teacher every six months.

E. Educational Engagement, Innovation, and Impact

Actions we’ve taken consistent with our mission to educate U.S. and allied military officers as well as defense civilians in defense-focused business and public policy, and our accompanying goals to extend graduate education opportunities to unreached Naval populations and to continue/expand current process improvement efforts.

1) Examples of educational engagement

- Biennial curriculum reviews with Naval senior leaders who sponsor our academic programs, which ensure curriculum-relevancy and continuous improvement to face their real-world challenges
- Campus/school/classroom visits by senior DoD, government, and civilian executives, which expose our students who are out of the operational military to current big issues, challenges, needs, perspectives
- Student capstone projects, required of all students, connect our students to practitioners and their challenges in the field; for example, our EMBA capstone projects require teams of EMBA students to complete consulting projects for senior leaders in their sponsoring organizations
- In the Manpower Systems Analysis program’s “thesis day”, five or six students brief their thesis projects to senior leaders in the Navy and Marine Corps Personnel organizations, including the Chief of Naval Personnel and staff
- The Financial Management area’s Conrad Scholar program selects up to four top students to complete theses and brief them to the Navy’s senior financial management leadership, including the Assistant Secretary and staff
- The Scientist-to-Sea program sent faculty (Alford, Bacolod, Dahel, Reich) on week-long at-sea tours, exposing them to real-world Navy life
- Faculty (Gibbons, Thomas) delivered first two of expected several dozen cross-cultural competencies course to Defense Security Cooperation workforce
- Faculty have consulted/advised Navy leadership on the Education for Seapower initiative (Augier, Dew, Lewis)
- Army one-day immersive workshop for senior acquisition leaders (Mortlock)
- Faculty are regularly engaged delivering content within the Center for Executive Education short courses for senior leaders within the DoD
- Successfully proposed a CFO certificate in response of DoD Comptroller RFP

2) Examples of educational innovation

- Revised our core lock-step course matrix, creating flexibility and white space for students to pursue elective course sequences
Developed a one-year Professional MBA degree targeting unreached student populations, and supporting a new Navy requirement for one year of resident graduate education for all officers prior to assuming major command.

Hired a faculty associate for instructional design and technology as a way to enhance our educational mission.

Piloted experience tours for financial management students, which expose them to operational financial and business practices in various defense organizations.

Educational brown bags expose faculty to new ways of using information technology to support classroom learning (e.g., Swivl robots, Tabletop learning glass boards, Wireless display adapters, second monitors with wireless displays, screencasting software).

Introduced resident education certificates, e.g., Lean Six-Sigma Yellow Belts for all students, Defense-related professional certifications, and preparation elective courses for certificates such as Certified Fraud Examiner.

“Stackable” distance education sequences of courses offered using an open enrollment model and leading to certificates, which target largely unreached Naval populations and align with the Navy’s new “Education for Seapower” initiative to create a Navy-wide university system.

Completely revised our Assurance of Learning program to more deeply ingrain programmatic-level assessments; engaged Karen Tarnoff, a well-respected expert on assurance of learning within the AACSB community, to lead a day-long workshop during which we revised and upgraded our program.

Developed and fielded a new distance learning studio and test-bed, allowing faculty to deliver and record educational content for our distance-based courses.

Transitioned our distance learning courses from Collaborate to Zoom.

Embedding instructional games within classrooms (strategy-building, coalition-building, change management, cash flow statements).

Developed a new teaching award for our EMBA program to complement the Liskin award, which recognizes the outstanding resident program teacher every six months.

In support of AACSB’s new emphasis on technology agility, we have taken several actions, including developing courses on Technology for Managerial Data Analysis, focusing on tools, including Python and GitLab, and skills for working with data; Advanced Topics in Manpower Policy Evaluation, which also addressed a sponsor request during the most recent review of the manpower curriculum, and which focuses on data presentation and data visualization using the R software environment; and Spend Analysis, using tools such as Excel, Stata, Tableau, and Saiku.

3) Examples of educational impact

- Student capstone projects routinely create real-world benefits, e.g., templates from student thesis are being incorporated into the Navy Manager’s Internal Control Manual to help with audit readiness.
- GSDM faculty produced defense-specific/relevant textbooks for Financial Management (Candreva); Acquisition Management (Rendon and Snider).
- Students used the process taught in our Strategic Communications workshop to win a Navy Award for a professional project.
- AQ Faculty (Mortlock) won the Project Management Institute Annual Teaching Case Competition with a military-specific case study on developing a new combat helmet.
- FM & OM faculty (Albright, Hudgens, et al.’s) case study selected for use in the Strategic Finance 2016 Student Case Competition.
Collaboration with Air Force Installation Contracting Agency yielded multiple benefits, including a strategic sourcing algorithm developed in a student-class that was briefed to the House Armed Services Committee.

Classroom policy memo on addressing Sexual Assault Prevention and Response in the Merchant Marine elevated personally to Secretary of Transportation; Navy offered to loan graduated student to Transportation Secretary to implement the policy.

Nick Dew chosen to receive a SIGS teaching award, the Lieutenant Commander David L. Williams Outstanding Professor Award, for contribution to another school on campus.

The table below summarizes alumni and sponsor evaluations of our educational engagement, innovation, and impact.

**Alumni & Sponsor Evaluations of Engagement, Innovation, and Impact**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic/Context</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student review of Process Analytics course</td>
<td>“I just have to say that I used your operations management training quite a bit at my previous job, and eventually worked my way up to the Lean Six Sigma Black Belt certification, so thank you!! You and the rest of professors gave me plenty of tools to pull out of my toolbox when the opportunity presents itself”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student review of Contract Pricing and Negotiation course</td>
<td>I am emailing to thank you for helping prepare me for my duties as the Chief of Contracting at MARSOC. Your negotiations class was priceless! As soon as I checked in, I took part in discussions for a $5M sole source FFP type requirement. I felt like I was back in your classroom. The offeror provided inflated hourly rates for employees they would provide us, that did not match the market rates for our area. Since it was a FFP the offeror didn’t have to provide the cost and pricing data, therefore they thought they had us in precarious situation. I chuckled after we received the offer, and immediately thought of your class. Thank you!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auditability and End State Process Analysis of The Ship Stores and NEXCOM Navy ERP Integration (2019)</td>
<td>Client (senior Naval leader) evaluation: “Looked at a complex process that involves antiquated systems and processes and developed a vision and plan to execute within Navy ERP. Their insight and thought process will bring fidelity to financial reporting and auditability for this process. Estimated savings about $350,000”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helicopter Sea Combat Maintenance Man-Hour Review (2019)</td>
<td>Client (Naval Deputy Commodore) Emailed Direction to Direct-Reports: “Wing Maintenance leaders, please comb over the project, suggest ways to implement recommendations, and set up a time to brief the Commodore in October [upon his return from a real-world disaster relief mission].”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Challenges Associated with Hiring and Maintaining Qualified Staff at Fleet Logistics Center Bahrain (2019)</td>
<td>Client (senior Naval leader) evaluation: “An opportunity to increase readiness and support throughout the 5th Fleet”; referred results to three Naval departments for review and implementation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Also, while not formally mission-focused, two of our students applied their business modelling course knowledge to help a local dentist office, with these results, “[We] went over to the dentist’s office yesterday to present our findings to the office staff...Suffice to say they were very grateful for the tools that we gave them, and we taught their office manager how to manipulate the data and run different simulations based off whatever other quantitative factors they want to simulate in the future. I don’t think [we] realized how much we learned until it was time to show it to someone else! Ultimately, based off our research, they are going to adjust their membership fee and also re-look at the amount of discount that they provide to their self-pay customers. They realized through our simulation that a 20% discount will eat into their profit margin so they are likely going to change it to 15%.”

6. Student Academic and Professional Engagement

A. Student Academic Engagement

Consistent with AACSB’s standards and our mission, we have designed our program to provide our students many opportunities to connect their education in the theory and practice of defense management with real-world challenges.

1) We designed the core of each curriculum to have courses in typical management disciplines (e.g., accounting) as well as those in the practice of defense management (e.g., budgeting). All core courses have significant defense content in terms of defense management cases, readings, and projects; this encourages students to operationalize mainstream management concepts and tools in the specific context of defense practice.

2) Each of our specialization curricula prepares students for practice in the areas to which they will be assigned following graduation. All of the courses in these specialty curricula have content that is exclusively relevant to professional practice, and meets needs articulated by educational program sponsors.

3) Most students accomplish their capstone degree requirement (whether thesis or professional project) on a topic of defense management practice related to their curricular specialty (e.g., budgeting, acquisition). This typically requires a significant level of professionally relevant engagement in that area, often through interaction with practitioners, data collection and analysis, and policy evaluation. DoD sponsors and other officials routinely provide topics for student research, and they also provide students with access to data sources. Often, when our faculty members are asked to perform studies and analyses for DoD sponsors, they will recruit students for these projects, which engage the students in important and relevant research. Appendix B contains an illustrative list of projects from our most recent graduates.

4) Nonresident GSDM students who pursue the EMBA, the MS in Contract Management (MSCM), or the MS in Program Management (MSPM) do so part-time while performing their full-time DoD jobs. They thus have relatively greater opportunities for experiential learning than do our resident students, applying course content to their daily work world.

   a) For their capstone projects, EMBA students engage in a collaborative problem-solving seminar that integrates the knowledge and skills gained in their EMBA courses. Students are introduced to an applied research framework designed to enable them to work from theory to identify a business problem to be solved for an organization, create a research design for data collection and analysis, and form conclusions and recommendations. Participants work
in small teams to prepare a project proposal, a final report, and a presentation containing recommendations to solve one of the organization’s business problems. Section 1 contained a few examples of projects and client feedback.

b) MSCM/PM students, as members of DoD’s acquisition workforce, are in positions that entail contract and program management tasks. They thus gain knowledge and skills that directly apply to their jobs. Most of these students accomplish their capstone Applied Project on a “real-world” problem under the joint advisement of a full-time NPS faculty member and a senior practitioner at the student’s agency.

5) GSDM has eight active-duty senior military faculty members who are assigned—typically for 3-year periods—to teach specialization courses to our students. Additionally, twelve faculty members are retired from active duty and who teach in specialization areas. This significant component of our faculty provides a strong and continuing professional focus of defense relevance for all of our students.

6) NPS conducts a regular (at least quarterly) series of special guest lectures that are required for all students; most of these feature talks by senior defense and/or industry officials. Speakers have included commanders of major military commands (4-star generals and admirals), many of whom studied at NPS, to the former executive chairman of Google and Alphabet, who taught at NPS in the 1990s.

7) The Annual NPS Acquisition Research Symposium provides students and faculty the opportunity to hear presentations from and interact with senior federal government and DoD acquisition professionals. Students who participate in the Acquisition Research Program present the results of their research projects to attendees during poster shows.

8) Our curricula regularly host guest speakers in their respective areas to lecture on curriculum-specific matters. These occur several times during the year and include sponsor visits during the biennial curriculum reviews. The opportunities include discussions concerning current issues in the profession as well as career advising.

9) In the course of their studies, students have opportunities to pursue professional advancement through certifications in a variety of management areas (e.g., Society for Human Resource Management Certified Defense Financial Manager, Certified Fraud Examiner, Certified Professional Contracts Manager, and Certified Professional in Supply Management). Further, there are several professional associations on campus and in the local Monterey area that students may join at their discretion and which represent various communities of defense-related interest (e.g., Surface Warfare Association, Supply Corps Association, Project Management Institute).

10) Piloted experience tours for financial management students, which expose them to operational financial and business practices in various defense organizations.

11) The Financial Management area’s Conrad Scholar program selects up to four top students to complete theses and brief them to the Navy’s senior financial management leadership, including the Assistant Secretary and staff. The Conrad program chair in Financial Management, a retired Vice Admiral and the Navy’s former Chief Financial Officer, works in the Capital region, liaising with Navy Budgeting personnel and providing real-world connections for our students.
B. Executive Education

NPS has a separate, dedicated organization, the Center for Executive Education, which offers traditional executive education to Admirals, Generals, their civilian-equivalents in the Senior Executive Service, and upwardly-mobile leaders just below that level. Our faculty participates in sessions appropriate to their expertise.

While not formally executive education, the Human Resources Center of Excellence delivers continuing professional education courses to the human resources workforce, and we have a program that also delivers continuing professional education to the Veteran’s Administration, focusing on process analytics to improve their healthcare delivery. Another organization administratively aligned under us, the Defense Resource Management Institute, delivers continuing professional education in resource management and analytical decision-making to US officers and militaries worldwide.

C. Faculty Qualifications and Engagement

Table 15-1 (Appendix R) shows that we are well within the AACSB expectations for participating faculty overall, with only the acquisition area falling below AACSB’s standards for scholarly academics. Similarly, Table 15-2 (Appendix S) shows that only the MSCM program, our distance education degree program in contract management, falls below AACSB’s standards for scholarly academics.

Given our focus on preparing students for defense sector management positions, some courses require deep knowledge of defense sector policies and procedures. We rely on active duty and retired military faculty to provide current knowledge and significant professional expertise. Many of these faculty members, particularly the active duty military officers, are classified as IP. While these faculty members are spread across all specializations, they are most heavily concentrated in our acquisition programs, where we provide specialized defense contract management and program management certifications in addition to graduate degrees. We absolutely need instructors with practitioner experience/expertise in these very practitioner-oriented fields, but we also recognize benefits of leveraging advanced academic disciplinary knowledge in new emerging fields of study like acquisition. Accordingly, our hiring efforts focus on faculty with doctorates and substantial experience (e.g., Mortlock), and we encourage faculty members (e.g., Jones) to obtain doctorates as well.

We have supported several initiatives to promote maintenance of faculty qualifications. The primary initiative involves the standard annual workload model for tenure track faculty. Tenure track faculty members who teach for two quarters receive salary for three quarters. This “3rd quarter” provides an opportunity for faculty to conduct research to stay current in their fields and provide service to GSDM, NPS, DoD, and their professional communities. Tenure track faculty members are expected to secure funding for their fourth quarter, either from external sponsors or from internal GSDM/NPS research programs.

The standard teaching workload is two courses per quarter (courses typically meet three to four hours per week over eleven weeks, plus a one-week finals period). We expect all faculty members to bear a fair-share student project or thesis advising load and provide service to GSDM, NPS, the professional community, and/or the academic community. This teaching load also provides at least some time for scholarly or professional research/consulting, especially when faculty members connect their own research to student theses/projects via advisement.
Non-tenure track faculty members do not receive the NPS-funded research quarter but are encouraged to seek external or internal research/consulting funding. They are encouraged to teach for three quarters and provide research or consulting services to reimbursable sponsors for one quarter. The tenure track and non-tenure track workload models are consistent with our mission as a research-oriented defense-focused institution. It provides sufficient opportunity for service and research productivity in both academic and professional activities.

To support a reimbursable research/consulting quarter for tenure track and non-tenure track faculty members, NPS and GSDM offer robust internal research programs (e.g., the NPS Naval Research Program and the GSDM Acquisition Research Program). These programs fund faculty research and emphasize questions of relevance to the operational military forces and to defense policy-makers. Thus, these opportunities represent service to our sponsors, they provide topics for our students’ capstone projects and classroom exercises, and they connect our students and faculty to practitioners throughout the defense community. Additionally, we typically have some limited direct funding to support faculty conference travel or other scholarship-related initiatives, if reimbursable funding is not available.

Successful recruiting and retention is the key to maintaining a qualified faculty. NPS and GSDM have implemented several initiatives to successfully attract and integrate new faculty members. NPS provides two years of “fourth quarter” funding to all new faculty members, including both labor and support for non-labor requests (research and conference travel, computer equipment, software, data bases, etc.). This “Research Initiation Program” funding is designed to facilitate new faculty members as they transition to NPS reimbursable sponsors.

We integrate new faculty members by assigning them a “host” faculty member immediately upon accepting an offer of employment. With our Department of Defense affiliation, our environment is generally unlike the academic environments familiar to our new faculty members. The host guides the new hire through the myriad administrative and cultural processes and activities. The host is responsible for assisting with a smooth transition into the GSDM environment and culture, including introductions to various administrative and academic offices across campus and a general orientation to Naval Postgraduate School. Following an initial relationship with the host, the new faculty member is expected to select a formal mentor, normally a senior member of the new hire’s academic discipline.

All new faculty members are also introduced to NPS’ instructional support resources, including the Director of Faculty Development; the NPS Center for Education Design, Development, and Distribution; the NPS Information Technology and Communications Services; and the NPS Librarian. New faculty members are encouraged to work individually or in group sessions with all four organizations to enhance their teaching effectiveness, including both resident and DL courses.

7. Additional Supporting Materials

A. Criterial for Faculty Classification

Appendix L describes our faculty classification criteria and process.

B. Consultative Review

To the three topics we suggested in our application, we add a fourth topic for which we would appreciate consultative feedback.
1. We are transitioning our EMBA from video conferencing to web-based delivery, and would appreciate learning any best practices for that transition, as well as for transitioning to asynchronous delivery.

2. We employ a variety of capstone "events" for different academic programs. We are interested in learning best practices and hearing advice regarding ensuring the capstone events reflect our program objectives, and in assessing the outcomes.

3. We have fielded our first certificate programs, and would appreciate learning any best practices in expanding and delivering them.

4. What strategies will enable schools of management to thrive in environments that emphasize STEM education and research?

At the team’s request, all appendices are available via an online repository at https://cle.nps.edu/portal/site/d899b3e6-d3b6-4b75-be1e-60ab2e984eb1. We will provide paper copies of appendices upon request.
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