

**STATEMENT OF**  
**BG WILLIAM C. HIX, USA**  
**DIRECTOR FOR OPERATIONAL PLANS**  
**AND JOINT FORCE DEVELOPMENT**  
**BEFORE THE**  
**SUBCOMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND INVESTIGATIONS**  
**OF THE**  
**HOUSE ARMED SERVICES COMMITTEE**  
**PROFESSIONAL MILITARY EDUCATION REPORT RESPONSE HEARING**  
**30 NOVEMBER 2010**

**Statement of BG WILLIAM C. HIX, USA**  
**House Armed Services Committee**  
**Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations**  
**30 November 2010**

Mr. Chairman, Mr. Wittman, Members of the subcommittee, thank you for the opportunity to meet with you and to discuss the subcommittee's report, titled "Another Crossroads? Professional Military Education Two Decades After the Goldwater-Nichols Act and the Skelton Panel." Joint Professional Military Education (JPME) is and will remain an essential pillar in Joint Officer Development, a Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff focus, and we appreciate the subcommittee's continued emphasis on and support for the JPME enterprise.

JPME is the foundation of a joint learning continuum that ensures our Armed Forces are inherently learning organizations. Within that continuum, education provides a broad body of knowledge and develops the habits of study and mind that underpin the ability to think critically in all situations and environments, an essential component of the military professional's expertise in the art and science of war. Our JPME system endeavors to produce: (1) strategically minded officers educated in the profession of arms who possess an intuitive approach to joint warfighting and are able to contribute to informed decision-making on the application of all instruments of national power; (2) critical thinkers who view military affairs in the broadest context and are able to identify system inputs and variables affecting the employment of military power; and (3) senior officers who can develop and execute national military strategies that effectively employ our Armed Forces in concert with other instruments of national power to help achieve the goals of national security strategy and policy.

The Chairman has specific Title 10 responsibility for "formulating policies for coordinating the education and training of members of the armed forces." The Chairman operationalizes this responsibility via Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff Instruction 1800.01D, "Officer Professional Military Education Policy" (OPMEP). In the OPMEP, the Chairman dictates rigorous institutional standards to ensure the proper environment for joint officer peers to achieve acculturation, as well as broad learning areas and objectives that must be addressed within JPME curricula. This foundational policy underpins JPME and provides an educational framework for officers to be immersed in the significant topics and issues associated with "Joint Matters." Furthermore, the Chairman executes this educational responsibility in concert with the Service Chiefs. With their advice and coordination, the Chairman establishes the joint requirements for each JPME institution, particularly at the intermediate

and senior levels of education. The Service Chiefs in turn infuse their component perspectives within school curricula to satisfy both Service and Joint PME requirements. It is within this context that the report's recommendations must be considered.

Specific to the subcommittee's review, we broadly concur with the report's conclusion that the "Professional Military Education System is basically sound" and that there are systemic and institutional areas that require our continued attention. As you are aware, the Joint Staff continues a cross-Departmental effort to analyze the report's recommendations. We expect this analysis to inform decisions this winter. While this effort continues, our preliminary conclusion gives broad endorsement to the report at the macro level. That being said, we believe three specific recommendations require further review.

The recommendation (page 43) that "subsequent revisions of the CJCS' vision for Joint Officer Development should identify how the Joint Qualification System will fulfill the requirements established in the Capstone Concept for Joint Operations (CCJO) for various specific and specialized joint officer competencies" will be addressed with the understanding the CCJO is fundamentally a road map for further concept development. The Chairman's Joint Officer Development vision aims to prepare officers for the CCJO-envisioned force. With much CCJO content moving into joint doctrine, we are on the right path with further work required.

Regarding the recommendation (page 98) that the "... department and CJCS should strengthen the Military Education Coordination Council and MECC working group with the formal inclusion of COCOM representatives at the level of the other participants," our experience shows that combatant command perspectives are valued and actively sought by the MECC community, with the Joint Staff bridging all parties. All applicable policies affecting joint officer development are coordinated directly with the combatant commands, and their inputs have driven changes to joint learning objectives. Further, given their unique roles in education, participation of U.S. Joint Forces Command and U.S. Special Operations Command ensures "customer" voices are heard. In addition, it should be noted that all JPME schools actively survey combatant commands regarding graduate performance.

Regarding the recommendation (page 111) that the "... CJCS and Service Chiefs should establish general criteria or credential requirements for selecting PME directors, commandants, commanders, and presidents to be applied at the Chairman's and Service Chiefs' discretion," we believe each assignment decision is unique to both circumstance and person, although we welcome the criteria outlined by the Skelton panel as a valuable insight to further inform the selection process.

In conjunction with the Office of the Secretary of Defense and the Services, the Joint Staff will continue to work through the report's recommendations in the coming months. Our expectation is the results of this effort will drive changes to policy and procedure, including the Chairman's Officer Professional Military Education Policy (OPMEP). Several issues raised by the report will likely be addressed through normal Military Education Coordination Council avenues and OPMEP revision processes. Our Process of Accreditation for Joint Education -- in which we take robust teams of highly experienced education practitioners from across the JPME community to perform in-depth reviews of school curricula and programs to accredit their status as JPME institutions -- will also give us the opportunity to review many of the issues raised by the report, as well as actions taken in response to those issues.

Congress has been very generous in providing resources to maintain our in-residence programs, as well as to support our robust JPME 1 programs. However, there is one issue for which we would like to solicit the subcommittee's support. The Joint Staff J-7 has submitted a legislative proposal to alter Sections 2154/2156 of Title 10 to provide authority to allow the Joint Forces Staff College (JFSC) to offer an alternative, non-resident JPME Phase II program at off-site locations hosted by the combatant commands and the Joint Staff; this would result in 10 locations total. The proposal was carried in the Senate Armed Services Committee's mark for the 2011 National Defense Authorization Act. First-year cost for the program is estimated at \$3.5 million, with additional out-years at \$2.7 million each. Our current production of JPME II qualified officers via our in-resident programs is limited to approximately 2,000 annually. This proposal would allow us to increase JPME II output by about 400-500 a year. The satellite campus course would be seminar-based -- an approach proven effective in our other JPME II institutions -- and taught by JFSC-hired and certified instructors. It would have the added benefit of allowing the combatant commands to select who they would like to attend, as well as offering the combatant commands some latitude to tailor portions of the program to meet their specific requirements. With the limited number of in-resident JPME II billets available, this would provide more officers access to rigorous joint education and the opportunity to gain the skills they need to excel in the joint arena.

### Conclusion

The dedicated and courageous men and women of our Armed Forces are truly our most vital and cherished strategic resource. Maintaining a highly educated and well-trained force capable of leveraging new ideas is absolutely essential if we are to succeed in the complex and fast-paced environment of current and future military operations. Our forces must

continue to exhibit the highest standards of honor, integrity, competence, and physical and moral courage, as well as dedication to duty and respect for human dignity. We will persist in exploring all available avenues to improve joint education to ensure our forces are equipped with the critical-thinking skills and mental dexterity needed to succeed in all environments. As in all our endeavors, Congress's continued support of joint education has and will enable us to maintain a vibrant and relevant JPME enterprise, and for that we are truly appreciative.

I stand ready to address your questions. Thank you.