

COLLINS CENTER UPDATE

A Center for Strategic Leadership and Development Newsletter

Volume 17, Issue 3

April-June 2015



INSIDE THIS ISSUE

- **Executive Leader Course 15-02**
- **Sustaining Professionalism: USAWC Strategic Planning Support to Burkina Faso**
- **Strategy Education Conference, May 2015**
- **Northwest Africa Wargame Informs AFRICOM Planning**
- **The Heritage Foundation on U.S. Military Strength**
- **USAWC's Homeland Defense and Security Community of Interest**

Executive Leader Course 15-02

Professor James Shufelt

Senior Leader Education Division, CSLD

The Center for Strategic Leadership and Development's successful execution of the first record iteration of the Executive Leader Course (ELC) provided a notable capstone to the distinguished military career of Command Sergeant Major (CSM) Malcolm D. Parrish, the U.S. Army War College's first CSM. CSM Parrish personally supervised all aspects of ELC concept development, curriculum refinement and the execution of the two ELC pilot courses and the first ELC record course, 7-19 June 2015.

Designed to prepare newly-selected nominative sergeants major for their duties as senior enlisted advisors (SEAs) and staff section sergeants major for

commanders of 1 and 2 star-level Army commands, the ELC is conducted by direction of Sergeant Major of the Army (SMA) Dan Dailey and is the final component of the NCO 2020 Noncommissioned Officer Professional Development System (NCOPDS) concept. Course content was developed based on critical knowledge gaps developed through analysis of surveys and interviews of Army senior officer and NCO leaders conducted by TRADOC's Institute for Noncommissioned Officer Professional Development (NCOPD) and Headquarters, Department of the Army's (HQDA) Sergeant Major Management Office (SMMO), along with SMA guidance and student feedback from the May and December 2014 pilot courses.

Thirty students from across the Army, to include two Army Reserve and four Army National Guard CSMs/SGMs, as well as a CW5 observer from HQDA



Executive Leader Course 15-02

This and other CSLD publications can be obtained free of charge online at: <http://www.csl.army.mil>.





Command Sergeant Major Parrish with the class at Gettysburg

G3/5/7, participated in ELC 15-02. Course activities included lectures from USAWC faculty and external speakers with follow-on facilitated seminar discussions on a wide variety of topics, ranging from national security, the economy, and communicating strategically to civilian personnel management, contracting, senior leader resiliency, the Army Professional Ethic and the NCO 2020 professional development system. A two-day trip to Washington DC, a strategic leader staff ride on the Gettysburg battlefield, an Army Heritage and Education Center (AHEC) tour, and multiple discussion sessions with serving and retired strategic leaders were highlights of the course.

Execution of ELC was a whole-of-USAWC effort, guided by USAWC CSM Malcolm Parrish and CSLD's Senior Leader Seminar team; USAWC staff and faculty members who served as ELC instructors included Ambassador Daniel Shields, Professor Frank Jones, Dr. Tom Williams, Lieutenant Colonel Brent Kauffman, Professors Muddy Waters, Chuck Allen, Al Lord, and Julie Manta, plus Dr. Don Snider. CSM (Ret.) Roger Blackwood served once again as the senior facilitator for this course.

Other notable course speakers included SMA Dailey; USAWC Commandant, Major General Rapp; the U.S. Central Command Senior Enlisted Leader, CSM Greca; the Western Pennsylvania Civilian Aide to the Secretary of the Army, Dr. Cooper; the U.S. Army Pacific SEA, CSM Lambert; the Principal Deputy Chief of Army Legislative Liaison, Mr. Ingold; Dr. Nora Bensahel and LTG (Ret.) Dave Barno from American University; Congressman Tim Walz (MN-D); senior Congressional committee staffers; a DA G3 Force Management speaker; a DA G8 Force Development representative; DA Protocol and Public Affairs leaders, the 1st Army Command Team, and the TRADOC CSM. Course activities also included student book reviews of Mark Stoler's biography of George C. Marshall and development of student individual learning plans to address personal knowledge, skills, and attribute gaps. The Washington DC trip, the strategic leader staff ride of the Gettysburg Campaign, and discussion sessions with serving and retired strategic leaders were key components of the course, according to participant surveys.

Student feedback for ELC remains consistently very positive and detailed

survey and after action review comments and analysis will assist CSLD in refinement of the ELC concept and will inform preparations for the next ELC course planned for December. One student noted, "...great to take a knee, put the urgent aside for two weeks and focus on the important, and take the opportunity to re-focus on the context!" Another student praised CSLD's execution of the course, stating: "the course setup and administration was right on target and was relevant to current issues in the Army."

— CSLD —

Sustaining Professionalism: USAWC Strategic Planning Support to Burkina Faso

Professor Bernie Griffard

Senior Leader Education Division, CSLD

"A coup in Burkina Faso last October is another example of a potentially useful political intervention by armed forces—even if far from ideal in a democracy.... One reason for it may be the growing professionalization of the continent's armies. After years of American training, many have become more sophisticated and possibly less brutal. The Pentagon has invested in skills, even when African governments really just wanted arms."

—"Good Coup, Bad Coup,"
The Economist, May 23, 2015

Designed to support Combatant Command theater security cooperation initiatives, the U.S. Army War College (USAWC) Military Strategy Review (MSR) reinforces military professionalization. The MSR is a three-phase program where separate workshops assist military planners by guiding them through the END-WAYS-MEANS steps of the strategic planning process. When Burkina Faso completed MSR, Phase III in May 2014, it was felt that Burkinabe armed forces planners had the tools to proceed with the development of a national military strategy. However, the

ouster of President Blaise Compaore in October 2014, resulted in large scale reassignment and changes of responsibility throughout the armed forces, and severely disrupted the planning process. To return the military strategy development effort to the main track, the Burkinabe Ministry of Defense requested the return of the USAWC Traveling Contact Team (TCT) to assist the new planning team in their efforts.

Comprised of Professor Bernard F. Griffard and Professor Bert B. Tussing from the USAWC Center for Strategic Leadership and Development (CSLD), the TCT based this fourth workshop on the previously developed deliverables. Conducted at the Ministry of Defense in Ouagadougou, Burkina Faso, 15-18 June 2015, the team facilitated the review and revision of previously identified military objectives and concepts within their new security environment.

The post-October 2014 Burkinabe armed forces have taken a serious look at Burkina Faso's altered political and security environment, and the military's roles and missions within that environment. As part of this security environment reassessment, the Ministry of Defense drafted a policy paper that identified three primary military objectives: defending the sovereignty of Burkina Faso from both external and internal threats, protecting its national institutions, and supporting the well-being of their citizenry. With these objectives in mind, the Burkinabe planners revisited their previously developed concepts.

Recognizing that the current structure of the Burkinabe armed forces was not optimally matched to the assigned missions, the Burkinabe planners identified specialty capabilities that could be shaped out of the existing structure. Since regional stability is a key factor in ensuring the territorial integrity of Burkina Faso, the continued enlargement of peacekeeping capabilities from two to three battalions was seen as essential. Internally, the armed forces

lack the mobility to provide timely response to tribal clashes and banditry. To meet this need, planners identified the requirement for a *Force d'Action Rapide*. Capable of reacting to both internal issues and threats to territorial integrity, the force will also provide visible evidence of the government's ability to protect its citizenry.

The Burkinabe armed forces commander is committed to the development and implementation of a military strategy that will allow him to lay out a long-term modernization plan that will result in a professional military force respected by their citizens. He is supported by a very capable Burkinabe planning team that will produce a product that is neither US nor French, but Burkinabe in nature. The Embassy mission plan and the Theater Security Cooperation Plan are both focused on supporting these efforts.

Contributing to the growth of professionalism in African armies is a major USAWC line of effort. The USAWC TCTs have supported USAFRICOM and USARAF TSCP initiatives in Burkina Faso, Niger, and Djibouti. These have been beneficial both to the countries involved and to the USAWC, where the TCT observations and lessons learned are transferred into the USAWC's strategic learning environment.

— CSLD —

Strategy Education Conference, May 2015

Mr. Steve Kidder
Senior Leader Education Division, CSLD

CSLD hosted the second Strategy Education Conference (SEC) 5-7 May 2015. The conference brought together educators from various PME institutions across the Army, collectively known as the Strategy Education Community of Interest (SE CoI). The SE CoI's purpose is to establish whether there is coherency in strategy education throughout the Army, and if not, make recommendations to the

Commandant, USAWC on how to fix it. The objectives of the May 2015 SEC were twofold: 1) refine the strategy education framework that had been developed in the first conference in September 2014, and 2) prescribe a methodology for conducting analysis of the various PME curricula to determine if strategy education is coherent or not.

In order to analyze the coherency of strategy education across the Army, the objective in the May 2015 SEC was to describe and define the strategic thinking competencies and enablers of that framework which are fundamental to developing strategic thinkers. These strategic thinking competencies were derived from research conducted by the U.S. Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences (ARI). The ARI research team interviewed 29 commanders, staff, and civilians who had operational experience with strategic level planning (2 civilians, 5 Lieutenant Colonels, 6 Colonels, 3 Brigadier Generals, 7 Major Generals, 4 Lieutenant Generals, and 2 Generals). Both the academic literature and the interview data were reviewed to identify the underlying knowledge, skills, and attributes (KSA) that are required to think strategically.¹ A total of 30 distinct KSAs were identified and for the sake of simplicity, were grouped into six strategic thinking competencies. Only one competency was modified from the draft in the first SEC: Creative thinking. The majority agreed that this competency could be better described as Innovative Thinking, so the change was implemented. Below are the descriptions that of each of the six strategic thinking competencies:

- *Comprehensive Information Gathering*. A strategic thinker continually scans the environment, seeks

1. Sackett, A., Karrasch, A., Weyhrauch, W., Goldman E. (in preparation). Enhancing the strategic capacity of Army leaders: An investigation of strategic-level tasks, skills, and development. ARI Special Report, Fort Belvoir: U.S. Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences.

information from disparate sources, suspends judgment and remains open minded, considers other perspectives, and possesses listening and research skills.

- *Lifelong Learning.* A strategic thinker is a lifelong learner who iteratively tests, reflects upon, conceptualizes, and manages knowledge to gain insights on the environment and continually examines one's own thinking.
- *Critical Thinking.* A strategic thinker identifies the essential aspects of a situation, questions assumptions, asks relevant questions, explains meaningful connections and distinctions, understands nuance, and considers the limits of data.
- *Innovative Thinking.* A strategic thinker generates creative and novel ideas, concepts, and approaches, independent of conventional norms.
- *Thinking in Time.* A strategic thinker understands historical and contemporary contexts, recognizes patterns, forecasts possible futures, anticipates second and third order effects, and has a long-term perspective.
- *Systems Thinking.* A strategic thinker uses a holistic perspective of the dynamic and complex environment to identify interrelationships and integrate disparate factors into a comprehensive whole.

The SE CoI was not able to fully define the strategic thinking enablers by the end of the conference, however, they were able to identify the following enablers:

- *Knowledge*
- *Collaboration*
- *Communication*
- *Emotional Regulation*
- *Ethical Reasoning*
- *Moral Courage*

Moving forward, the SE CoI agreed to conduct a broad assessment of their curricula over the next several months. Questions to guide analysis: 1) Are you teaching the strategic thinking competencies in your curricula? 2) Are you arming your students with the necessary strategic thinking enablers which support these competencies? 3) Are you teaching the art of strategy development in any of your curricula? A third conference will be scheduled this fall which will bring together the SE CoI to report on their analysis. From these reports, the SE CoI will be able to determine whether or not there is coherency in strategy education across the Army. Future conferences will then be dedicated to providing appropriate remedies if required.

— CSLD —

Northwest Africa Wargame Informs AFRICOM Planning

*Lieutenant Colonel Brent Kauffman
Strategic Wargaming Division, CSLD*

On May 27-28, 2015, the Center for Strategic Leadership and Development (CSLD) partnered with U.S. Africa Command (USAFRICOM) to conduct a wargame focused on countering the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant (ISIL) in Northwest Africa. This classified, multi-sided wargame achieved its desired objective to provide the combatant commander and his directors with insights that better synchronize and integrate joint, interagency, and multinational contributions to AFRICOM's real-world planning effort to address instability in Northwest Africa.

The idea for this wargame was born in January 2015, when the AFRICOM J3 visited CSLD and received a briefing on its wargaming capabilities. Beginning in early March, CSLD quickly defined and planned the wargame by conducting seven planning sessions with key AFRICOM staff members.

Since the inception of the USAWC Strategic Wargaming Series in 2012, this was the largest wargame to date. There were 77 total participants, including those from AFRICOM staff, service component commands, non-DoD departments and agencies, foreign militaries (Great Britain, France, Italy, and Canada), and other organizations, thereby justifying the event be called a wargame rather than a staff exercise.

In terms of wargame design, the participants were assigned to one of four blue cells, the red cell, or the large white cell. Each blue cell consisted of about a dozen participants and focused on a specific intermediate objective. After an opening plenary in which AFRICOM briefed their plan and fielded questions, the wargame was conducted in three turns. Each turn consisted of a group session (90 minutes) and a plenary session (approximately 120 minutes), and each turn covered a period of six months. For the final plenary, AFRICOM staff members briefed key takeaways to their J3 – the senior sponsor for the wargame.

Overall, the success of this Northwest Africa wargame served as a blueprint for larger, customer-focused events for the Strategic Wargame Series. By partnering with a combatant command staff with a high operations tempo and separated by 4,000 miles (and six time zones), a few coordination challenges were encountered. Several lessons learned were captured for the next iteration of a similar wargame in size and scope. For example, the team developed a pre-game workshop for a subset of participants. The two-hour workshop was designed to inform interagency participants of AFRICOM's plan at a convenient location in Washington DC so the respective departments and agencies could develop positions and proposals in order to support the plan at the wargame. This pre-game workshop concept will be retained for future adaptation and use.

The Heritage Foundation on U.S. Military Strength

Professor John Powell

Senior Leader Education Division, CSLD

On Friday, May 1, Mr. Dakota L. Wood of the Heritage Foundation provided a briefing to staff and faculty of the U.S. Army War College at the Center for Strategic Leadership and Development on the think tank's *2015 Index of U.S. Military Strength*. Mr. Wood, the chief editor of the Index, was accompanied by Policy Analyst Brian Slattery, and Dr. Steven P. Bucci, Director of the foundation's Center for Foreign and National Security Policy.

The Index provides a snapshot of the Department of Defense in terms of the current year, detects trends and policy in the immediate and foreseeable future, and examines resource decisions. In its publication, Jim DeMint, President of the Heritage Foundation, was quick to note: "We harbor no illusion that we can replicate the detailed analysis that the military services are capable of performing." But the decision to produce an Index came about through the recognition that there was not a publicly accessible reference document "that uses a consistent, methodical, repeatable approach to assessing defense requirements and capabilities."

The Index suggests that an assessment of military requirements must begin with a clear depiction of the country's vital security interests. Having reviewed the National Security Strategies of several Administrations, the Index suggests there are three such interests:

1. Defense of the homeland
2. Successful conclusion of a major war having the potential to destabilize a region of critical interest to the United States
3. Preservation of freedom of movement within the global commons: the sea, air, outer-space, and cyberspace domains through which the world conducts business.

In order to guarantee these interests, the Index held that the "two-MRC requirement" – an ability to "handle two major wars or two major regional contingencies (MRC) successfully" at or near the same time, provided the most compelling rationale for sizing and equipping the U.S. military forces.

Wood and his staff continued framing the Index in three approaches. Having identified the vital interests, the next approach was to identify threats to those interests. Beyond the threat, Heritage's analysts worked to characterize the strategic environment in terms of regions. Finally, the staff focused on what they saw as the military requirements and resources to defend our interests against those threats and within those regions, most often characterized by what the study referred to as "hard" military power.

Mr. Wood suggested that the Index could become a resource for current and future leaders facing new and evolving threats. He noted, specifically, conditions in Iran, Turkey, Saudi Arabia, and Egypt, and suggested that all of them may become "future members of the nuclear club."

The Index was designed to provide general assessments for strategic decision-makers, as well as the implications of perceptions surrounding those assessments. He noted that the U.S. military has over a decade of experience in combined operations with allies that has fostered deep, combat-tested interoperability. At the same time, however, he remarked U.S. military power is rapidly aging and shrinking, and contended an inability to fulfill the "two MRC" requirement. Summarizing, Wood asked the audience: "How do our friends and enemies interpret this?"

As the presentation was concluding, the audience was queried as to how they believe the next iteration of the Index could be improved. While there seemed to be a consensus surrounding the general tone of the document's assessment, some members of the audience questioned specific data

contained therein. Likewise, discussion emerged over the choice of the two MRC construct in preparing for the emerging, and even the current threat environment. And predictably, some mention was made on the importance of incorporating cyberwarfare issues in future editions of the publication.

As a final observation, however, an assessment of the *2015 Index of U.S. Military Strength* presents the readers with five uncomfortable conclusions for the military:

1. Allies, though stable, are less capable
2. Threat actors are growing in capability and presence
3. U.S. military is aging and shrinking in size
4. Conditions are ripe for exploitation by competitors
5. Trends in the Index are somewhat worrisome

— CSLD —

USAWC's Homeland Defense and Security Community of Interest

Professor Bert B. Tussing

Director, Homeland Defense and Security Issues Group, SLED, CSLD

Early in his tenure as the 50th Commandant of the United States Army War College, Major General Rapp called for the establishment of four specified "Communities of Interest" (CoI) bringing together the representative talents of every element of the college's teaching, research and practitioner community. One focus area is *Strategic Futures*, aimed at assisting the Army in an examination of ideas relevant to the Army's force requirements in 2025 and beyond. A second is *Strategic Education*, directly pursuing the Commandant's intent that the Army War College remains the Army's chief proponent of education in strategy across the professional military

education (PME) continuum. A third focus is being directed through a CoI dedicated to *Cyberspace Operations*, acknowledging a responsibility on the part of USAWC to contribute in education, engagement, and research surrounding the ubiquitous concerns of cyber security. The final area of specified focus on Commandant's agenda is *Homeland Defense and Security* (HDS).

The Commandant's charter for the HDS CoI is to assist the Army and its stakeholder partners in understanding and meeting the challenges of homeland security, homeland defense, and defense support of civil authorities (DSCA). The USAWC has been actively engaged in these issues since prior to 9/11, actually convening a summit on what were seen as emerging requirements in the regimes in August of 2001. Since that time, the war college has engendered and sustained relationships and partnership in the fields that have stretched across all three levels of government, the public and private sectors, the academic community, and – of course – the active and reserve components of the Army and its sister services. The CoI is intent upon drawing from and contributing to exchanges surrounding domestic security, certainly as they pertain to supporting civil authorities in traditional DSCA missions, but also examining the appropriate intersections and divisions of the military's support to civil law enforcement agencies. Moreover, the HDS CoI will seek to become a conduit of exchange for thought surrounding the proper role and employment of the Army in homeland defense missions – an admittedly unlikely scenario, but one that still calls for extraordinary forethought should unlikely requirements arise.

While only recently institutionalized as an entity spanning the war college's strength and resources, the previously established relationships alluded to above will provide a fruitful ground for expanded collaboration in the CoI's initiatives. The Army War College has

enjoyed frequent exchanges with the Department of Homeland Security since the moment of its inception; has contributed to initiatives launched by the Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Homeland Defense and Global Security; has convened numerous forums in support of NORTHCOM, the National Guard, the National Guard Bureau, and the Office of the Chief of the Army Reserve; and has partnered with the nation's top think tanks focused on domestic security issues. In fulfilling the Commandant's vision, the CoI will continue to build upon those relationships, and even expand by drawing representatives from each into its ranks. In particular, the CoI will attempt to align its efforts and initiatives with those of Army Capabilities Integration Center (ARCIC) and the Maneuver Support Center of Excellence as the Army develops its Homeland Operations Warfighting Challenge.

Within the USAWC itself, beyond plans for organizing and hosting forums focused on the issues, the CoI will spearhead efforts toward including homeland defense, DSCA, and associated functions in the curricula of the resident and distance education programs. In addition to an introductory presentation in the core curriculum of the resident program, plans are to continue electives on *Homeland Security Strategy and Policy*, *Defense Support of Civil Authorities*, and the Department of Homeland Security "simulation cell" of the *Joint Land, Air and Sea Strategic Exercise* (JLASS-EX) program. The Community will also sustain and expand its support of the robust focus on the issues played out in Department of Distance Education's (DDE) syllabus, ranging from the well-practiced interaction between the National Guard and their state and local emergency management officials, to the emerging intricacies of the Dual Status Commander concept and the Department of Defense's (DoD) evolving concern over "complex catastrophes." Beyond these mainstays

of Carlisle's educational process, the HDS CoI will work to conduct extracurricular forums. These may be in the form of "noontime lectures" made available to the resident class (and DDE classes during their resident periods at Carlisle); or through special lectures presented to visiting workshops, strategy forums, et al., designed to bring special attention to the pervasive, though often overlooked security requirements that exist *within* our territorial confines.

Indeed, as the preponderance of DoD's focus seems *outward*—detecting, deterring, defending against and defeating threats to our people in the "forward regions" and "approaches" to the homeland – the CoI will try to draw attention to threats that may make their way *into* the homeland. Paying deference to the Unified Command Plan's call for a "global integration of plans" for the nation's defense, the Community hopes to assist in drawing attention to the final layer of our "active, layered defense-in-depth." And while acknowledging that the preponderance of threats to the citizenry within our borders are most appropriately handled by law enforcement, the CoI will support an examination of when the threat to our people can, or should be viewed as an act of war, as opposed to a criminal activity. Currently there is little to assist our policymakers and executors in delineating these distinctions. The Homeland Defense and Security Community of Interest believes it is time to examine the requirements, and develop an intellectual template for our nation's leadership.

As the engagement lead for the Community of Interests, USAWC's Center for Strategic Leadership and Development is interested in receiving observations and input from the expanse of stakeholders actively involved in cyberspace operations, strategy education, strategic futures, and homeland defense and security. For specific concerns surrounding the HDS CoI, please contact Professor Bert Tussing at: bert.b.tussing.civ@mail.mil.