

**MINUTES**  
**Defense Acquisition University (DAU)**  
**Board of Visitors (BoV)**

Meeting Date: September 10, 1997

Place: Defense Systems Management College (DSMC), Building 184

0835 - **Welcome** - Mr. Thomas M. Crean, DAU President welcomed the members of the Board and the staff in attendance. He also introduced new members of the Consortium schools and guests in attendance.

Dr. Gansler noted in preparation for his upcoming confirmation hearing, he has meetings with a number of Senators scheduled for today and would have to leave for a portion of the meeting. He will return following those scheduled meetings.

Mr. Hirsch, the Defense Systems Management College (DSMC) Deputy Commandant and Provost is sitting-in for BG Black, the DSMC Commandant. Mr. Hirsch stated the DAU Office of the President and DSMC have been working together and now the DSMC has been made an operational arm of the DAU Office of the President. There are 700 students taking DSMC classes, at present. 500 students are on the DSMC campus at Fort Belvoir and 200 students are at four other locations. The BoV assistance and guidance is even more necessary now as the DSMC faces the challenges to be outlined in today's briefings, such as becoming a world-class institution.

Dr. Gansler noted in his recent meetings with some Senators, they are focusing on the education of the acquisition professionals. The Senate staff are asking questions about whether the acquisition workforce is up-to-date and whether senior-level acquisition professionals are being updated. The conclusion is education is critical.

Mr. Crean announced today's Agenda would have to remain flexible because of the unscheduled brief on the recent Process Action Team findings to be presented later.

0840- **Policy on Continuing Education** - Dr. McMichael started the discussion stating this report was in response to a BoV action item to provide a briefing on the policy and guidelines for continuing acquisition education. The briefing will present the DAU and Consortium draft plan. This includes the requirement for the Functional Boards to specify the updating required by the workforce and the continuing acquisition education required by the acquisition-related (not just the DAWIA) workforce. The continuing acquisition education policy and program intersect, but have aspects which are independent. The policy to be briefed by Mrs. Carney has a specific target, the acquisition workforce covered by DAWIA, but is broad in content. The objective of the policy is to professionalize the workforce. The program to be briefed by Dr. Sack is specific in content, acquisition education, but has a broad target. The objective of the program is to keep the workforce current.

**0845 - Report - Proposed Policy on Continuous Learning for the Acquisition Workforce Members** - Mrs. Jeanne Carney, Staff Specialist for Acquisition Education Training and Career Development stated the policy is still in draft and some early comments have not yet been incorporated. Mrs. Carney introduced the concept of "Continuous Learning" and explained the policy was built on the (current) entire career program. In that the career program is built on three principal foundations, or components - training, education and experience - it is logical to take advantage of and enhance all three components when providing opportunities for maintaining currency. As background, she reminded the BoV members about the DUSD(Acquisition Reform) interim policy established in August, 1996. The interim policy required 40 hours per year or 80 hours biennially of continuing education, including 16 hours in Acquisition Reform subjects; academic course work to meet statutory and desired standards; cross training and higher levels of certification training; and conferences and other professional activities. The interim policy evoked two opposite reactions from participants: some people questioned the need for more training, asserting that acquisition personnel already have ample training; others asserted that the interim policy was insufficient in that it did not address the full scope of developmental opportunities that should be applied to enable people to remain current and to round out the career program. The BoV members were reminded of the career program structure, the foundation on which the proposed policy was built. The career program structure includes three parts: training, education, and experience each with a "mandatory" subpart and some with "desired" subparts.

The next step in the policy development was to determine what's missing from the career program that can be enhanced by developing a new policy and new career program framework to structure options for enhanced programmatic offerings. The private sector, professional associations, Federal workforce standards, and workforce development programs were researched. Mr. Adolph pointed out training is always available but the individual must take the initiative to pursue it.

Feedback from the interim policy and Acquisition Reform Days stated the career program only addresses the minimums (i.e., no electives); leadership competencies are largely ignored and there is no individualization. Dr. Gansler questioned what would happen after the minimums were met and (things) "the World" changes. Therefore time should be a variable. Mr. Levi stated, while there is nothing wrong with leaving one's progression up to the individual, it seemed as if this policy was just raising the minimum. Dr. Gansler said incentives are missing. Lt. Gen. Ferguson said the emphasis has been placed on functional education and should be placed on integrated (team) training. Mrs. Carney responded that by building continuous learning options into each component of the career program, with flexibility for needs to be identified at the individual, supervisory and team levels, the policy and framework allow for every conceivable variety of just-in-time continuing development ranging from acquisition reform courses, cross-training in other career fields, developmental assignments to practice new skills, team-based training, and tuition assistance to stay current in technical disciplines, meet business course requirements, or even pursue advanced degrees. In addition, Mrs. Carney noted that the policy allows for managerial and leadership development, with special

opportunities at Level III. Mr. Adolph pointed out Senior Executive Service members agree to a mobility clause, but it was pointed out it is not often enforced. The goal of the proposed policy is to integrate the concept of continuous learning into the career program framework to enable workforce members to stay current in a variety of ways. The definition of continuous learning is professional development plus continuing education. Dr. Eaton pointed out the problems of tracking the 80 "contact" hours given distance learning. The features of the policy are: annual Individual Development Plans (IDPs), academic courses, functional and technical training, leadership competencies, experiential and rotational assignments, senior personnel enhanced standards, notional development frameworks, notional career field guides, and policy effective in stages. Lt. Gen. Ferguson said we must think of a team development plan and function as a team. This is differentiated from leadership training.

The issue of financial support for academic course work was raised. Mrs. Carney pointed out tuition assistance is available to enable acquisition workforce members to get their degrees. Dr. Gansler stated this could be used as an incentive. Lt. Gen. Ferguson stated course work supported by the government has to be job related. Mrs. Carney pointed out DAWIA had changed this provision. Acquisition is defined as a scarce skill until 2001 and tuition assistance is authorized to pay for degrees for acquisition personnel, including courses necessary to meet degree requirements that may not necessarily be job-related.

Mrs. Carney's presentation was interrupted for a report on the recent Process Action Team (PAT) findings.

0935 - Mrs. Donna Richbourg, *Acting Deputy Under Secretary of Defense (Acquisition Reform)* introduced the PAT as having a difficult task and working hard over a short time frame to reach the recommendations included in their report. The report was recently briefed to Dr. Hamre, Deputy Secretary of Defense and former Under Secretary of Defense (Comptroller). Accreditation was addressed in the briefing because of Dr. Hamre's interest. The PAT utilized some real out-of-the-box thinking and vision and even considered outsourcing all education and training. There is consensus on the proposed end-state but some disagreement on how to achieve the end-state. A DAU and DSMC transition plan will be developed. This alternate transition plan along with all comments will be presented at the next Defense Acquisition Career Development Council (DACDC) meeting to be held as early as October, 1997. The PAT recommendations are just recommendations and while some decisions have been made, major decisions on the recommendations will be made later.

0940 - Mr. Eric Levi, chaired the PAT and pointed out the briefing represented an outline of the report. Mr. Levi thanked the PAT members for their time and hard work. The PAT was asked to forget "politics" and become totally impartial, while keeping in mind they were working for the benefit of the Acquisition workforce. Mr. Longuemare, the Acting USD(A&T) asked the team to "define an end-state" while addressing seven chartered requirements. The PAT was asked to discount marginal modifications to the present structure and include a time-phased (transition) plan in their recommendations.

technology-based learning more extensively; and provide for continuing acquisition education.

Lt. Gen. Ferguson asked if all present consortium members should be part of the Defense Acquisition Institute. Mr. Levi replied based on best-value, each current member could provide the necessary services. Mr. Adolph stated the timelines presented in the PAT report are not achievable and questioned why a new organization is proposed. Mr. Levi responded the PAT was challenged to think radically and not tinker with the current state. Mrs. Richbourg and Dr. Gansler stated this is not criticism of the past organization but a focusing on what is needed and an attempt to accelerate the change process. Dr. Eaton pointed out fundamental changes are required and the present organizational flaws have resulted in students being hurt. Dr. Sanders stated there is no disagreement on the end state, but there should be near term and long term portions to the transition process. Mr. Gallagher questioned whether there was a process for Service and/or consortium, etc. comments to be incorporated by someone into the PAT report. A September 9, 1997 USD(A&T) memorandum requested DACDC and Functional Board Chair comments by September 26, 1997. Two specific areas were questioned: #1. Do you concur with the end state? #2. Focus on the appropriateness of the transition plan. Alternative transition plans will be considered at the next DACDC meeting (planned for October, 1997). New charters will be coordinated for all Functional Boards.

Mr. Crean stated despite the recognized organizational deficiencies, the DAU has delivered a good program while dealing with throughput problems and backlogs of students needing training and keeping the acquisition workforce updated. Mr. Wargo interjected the DAU is behind in some initiatives because the resources have been lacking and there hasn't been enough investment funds. Dr. Gansler said the DAU should build on what has been done in order to accelerate the process. The DAU must look at resources and leverage with outside organizations.

1040 - **BREAK**

1100 - Meeting resumed with the continuation of Mrs. Carney's presentation on the proposed continuous learning policy with Mr. Levi presiding as BoV Chair. Mrs. Carney presented the notional development framework which places all the pieces together for career long development. The Notional Career Field Development Guides are now being reviewed by the Components and Functional Boards. This model is the notional framework for supervisors and workforce members to use, in conjunction with specific guidance from the relevant Functional Board, for developing Individual Development Plans (IDPs).

The proposed policy will be effective in stages. In FY 1998 the policy will be issued and the 80 hour standards would become effective and funding would be identified. In FY 1999 the senior development selection process and throughput would be identified, along with equivalents to SAC/ICAF, if necessary. In FY 2000 enhanced standards for senior acquisition personnel would be established and by FY 2005 SAC (or equivalent) would

be a required for SES/Flag/GO positions. Remaining issues are: funding, management information system shortfalls, the impact of rotational assignments and cross training, the selectivity for more senior development, re-certification, and interface with DLAMP. In conclusion the DoD would use continuous learning to: achieve traditional continuing education objectives; enhance the career program standards to create a framework for workforce development in stages over a complete career; integrate classroom learning with experiences tailored to each individual, organization, and career field; and prepare the next generation of senior acquisition leaders.

Dr. McMichael summarized the actions/comments including: the challenge to build currency into the present structure; to add incentives; and to build team behavior and a team development plan. Dr. Rich Murphy (AFIT) added we must also provide incentives for the supervisors.

**1130 - Continuing Acquisition Education** - Dr. Lenore Sack, DAU Director for Academic Affairs, presented the briefing which resulted from the National Performance Review (NPR) goal #4 to offer 40 or more hours of continuing education and training activities per year to the DoD acquisition community. The hours are encompassed in four areas of education and training: awareness, certification, information, and assignment specific training. The plan is to: enable 22% of the DAWIA workforce to cross-train; enable 15% of the DAWIA workforce to take career advancement certification; provide satellite broadcasts to a very broad audience (partnering with other agencies, industry, etc.); to provide 12 distance learning courses to a very wide audience; and host four activities to meet Functional Board requirements. The issues are: resources, marketing, and management. Mrs. Richbourg questioned whether the faculty (schools) have been contacted for their continuing education ideas. Some ideas already presented include Acquisition Law and Alternate Dispute Resolution. Mr. Levi stated, with regard to the PAT report and briefing made previously, the faculty should be interfacing with the Functional Boards.

**1150 - Just-In-Time Training** - LTC R. Alan Gregory, Acquisition Reform Communications Center (ARCC) Director presented a status report on the ARCC, whose mission is to provide and disseminate information rapidly to the acquisition workforce. Satellite broadcasts (Just-In-Time Training) are being developed on a number of topics including, but not limited to: FAR Part 15, Performance Based Service Contracting, Cost As an Independent Variable (CAIV), and Earned Value Management. The challenges are the expanded audience requiring the information, the development of the message, and methods of evaluating the training effectiveness. Mr. Levi questioned whether the ARCC was established only because dynamic acquisition reform topics could not be incorporated into the formal courses quickly enough. Through the academic review process, all courses are evaluated every 6 months or less and changes are incorporated into the formal courses as quickly as possible. However, the ARCC was established because of the large audience requiring updated information, in a very short time-frame.

**1210 - LUNCH**

1310 - **Acquisition Reform (AR) Week Feedback** - Mr. Skip Hawthorne from the Office of the Deputy Under Secretary of Defense (Acquisition Reform) presented the findings and data analyses from a number of recent surveys conducted for the USD(A&T). A FY 1996 survey conducted a baseline assessment of problems and progress in implementing Overarching Integrated Process Team and Working Integrated Process Team (OIPT/WIPT) processes among Acquisition Category (ACAT) I programs (programs with a threshold above \$10 million). A FY 1997 survey updated the FY 1996 survey baseline and assessed year-to-year changes in implementing the OIPT/WIPT processes among the ACAT I programs. Finally, Mr. Hawthorne reported on the AR Week assessment on the progress of Integrated Process Team (IPT) and other AR initiatives across the Acquisition Workforce.

1320 - Dr. Gansler returns and presides as BoV Chair.

Mr. Hawthorne highlighted five IPT survey areas: Effectiveness - the current IPT process facilitates effective decision making with issues resolved in a timely and effective manner; empowerment - IPT members are empowered to speak for their organizations and WIPT positions are seldom overturned by OIPT members; contractor involvement - support contractors generally enhance WIPT effectiveness; AR assessment - Acquisition Reform is making a difference, and AR Week value - AR week was an effective method of team training and should be repeated at least yearly. In summary, ACAT I IPT effectiveness is improving over time. Contractor involvement adds value and member empowerment improved. Acquisition Reform has improved the acquisition process and AR Week is valuable and should be repeated.

1340 - **The DSMC and Graduate Business School Comparison** - Mr. Dave Scibetta presented the briefing which is in response to a BoV recommendation. The DSMC contacted 20 graduate business schools, 15 of which were in the top 25 graduate business schools, according to a *US News and World Report* survey (March, 1997). The data collected focused on average platform hours per week for a mid-level faculty member (associate and assistant professors, as opposed to full professors or adjunct faculty) and the number of teaching weeks per year. The American Association of University Professors policy on teaching workload was presented. The DSMC lead the list with 8.4 contact hours per week compared with a range of 7.0 to 2.3 hours. Contact hours includes all classroom time (lectures, case studies, student presentations). The DSMC also has an academic year of 43 weeks, compared to most schools who reported 30 weeks. It was pointed out the University of Virginia reported 39 weeks because their faculty is required to participate in a 9 week summer session.

1355 - **The Executive Institute (EI) Report on Strategic Initiative #6** - Mr. Tony Kausal, the DSMC Air Force Chair presented the EI briefing the DSMC becoming a World Class Institution. Mr. Kausal began with a background on the dynamic acquisition world as: having decreasing budgets, fewer people, fewer major programs, smaller industry, international programs, and reforms. Mr. Kausal continued with presenting the

The PAT members, only four of which were outside the DoD, endured weeks of briefings to develop the following seven findings with recommendations:

1. The present DAU organizational structure results in inappropriately defined lines of authority and a lack of accountability.  
A Defense Acquisition Institute should be created with a senior executive totally responsible for the education and training process and reporting directly to the USD(A&T). The senior executive is to be supported by a Provost responsible for operations.  
Institute should operate with minimal staff (preliminary target of 100-150 individuals down from the approximately 700 individuals).  
Up-front resource investments are required to achieve the longer term goals of increased productivity, effectiveness and cost savings.
2. The curriculum design process needs to be re-engineered with expanded requirements and Functional Board influence minimized (the faculty presently rely too much on the Functional Boards for curriculum design). Mr. Adolph stated Functional Board interaction with the faculty has been beneficial.
3. Technology-based training must be expanded and accelerated.
4. The Institute should aggressively contract out acquisition education activities. Mrs. Richbourg pointed out this must be based on best-value, which includes a quality factor.
5. The charters of the Functional Boards are too broad in scope. The USD(A&T) should differentiate the responsibilities for training requirements (Functional Boards) from the responsibilities for curriculum development (the Defense Acquisition Institute).
6. A Functional Board chair should not be a consortium member.
7. Non-DAWIA training needs are not adequately addressed.

The USD(A&T) has made two decisions so far, as follows:

1. The DSMC will report to the DAU.
2. No consortium school member will chair a Functional Board.

The process for attaining the end-state and the details of the organization were presented. The end-state is a virtual learning network which reports directly to the USD(A&T). A Vision and Mission statement were identified. The Vision is broad and important enough to be acted upon. The Mission meets the acquisition education and training needs of the Department. It provides a centralized learning network and a research and analysis function on defense acquisition policy issues and practices. The transition strategy must assure: current training needs continue to be met; technology-based education continues and is accelerated; and the funding is available to implement the transition plan. The PAT developed a fully operational end state (November 1999) then backed-up and filled in the steps from there. Detailed major milestones in the transition process were presented. In summary, the Defense Acquisition Institute would: be accountable as a provider of acquisition education, not only as a coordinator; design and develop the curriculum and course content; feature a preeminent faculty; reach beyond the current DAWIA workforce; be smaller than the current consortium; use

changing education environment as: increasing the audience beyond DAWIA personnel, employing more technology-based education and training, having more industry student involvement, mandating continuing education, mandating outsourcing and privatization; and shifting from Level I to Levels II, III, and beyond. Mr. Kausal explained the DSMC world as: one of more teaching, with less research, loss of curriculum control, and negative outside/customer perceptions. He continued defining world class as: being recognized for the highest quality of products/services, recognition by acquisition practitioners, the source of innovation/problem solving, being sought after as consultants/researchers, having the best and latest knowledge and ideas, and being leaders in their field. Mr. Kausal pointed out the shortfalls/barriers as: increasing teaching hours, loss of curriculum development to the Functional Boards, military faculty assignments being inappropriate, civilian faculty being inexperienced, and students not having the proper prerequisites. The EI recommendations on what needs to be done are: garner senior-level management support; revise the Functional Board charters; focus on core business; revise the mix between teaching, research, and consulting; develop a faculty recruitment plan; support faculty development and rotational assignments; place a high priority on research and publication; decline unqualified faculty and assess the military faculty mix and assignments; increase adjunct faculty; reject students who have not met course prerequisites; and identify the top 10% of students. In summary, achieving "world class" is a long term effort requiring setting tough standards and getting senior leadership support.

#### 1445 **BREAK**

1500 - **Stimulating External Research in Acquisition** - Mr. Frank Sobieszczyk briefed the external DAU program and Dr. Price briefed the DSMC initiatives for research stimulation as an ongoing internal research program and a new, external research program. As background, Mr. Sobieszczyk presented the two research categories. Intramural research was defined as keeping the curriculum current, keeping the educators current, publication preparation, and consulting. The BoV advice sought was whether funds should be reserved for in-house (intramural) faculty research. External research was that which DAU "sponsored" and "brokered". Mr. Sobieszczyk presented the essential elements and activities required for the external program. Most of these requirements are already within the current DAU charter. The elements not within the current DAU charter are: to act as an Ombudsman for external research communities and to provide "insight" to all DoD sponsored acquisition research for analysis, not control. The basic principles of the external program are: "best value" - all performers vie for funding on the basis of pre-established criteria; peer review - of proposals and outcomes; established mechanisms - for reporting outcomes and integrating outcomes into the curricula. The criteria are broken into two tiers: First, includes: a well-defined research objective, a disciplined research methodology, relevancy to DoD Acquisition Management, past performance, and advances to the state-of-the-art in Acquisition Policy. Second tier criteria includes: deliverables (usability, applicability, etc.), any value multipliers (cost-sharing, etc.), and the benefits to multiple policy objectives. In order to get the program into operation the DAU must: establish and staff an operational element

to administer the program, redefine the Acquisition Research Coordinating Committee (ARCC) role, and establish a funding baseline. The program could be operational by December 31, 1997.

Dr. Eaton pointed out the topics needed to be as general as possible. Dr. Eaton knew of Requests for Proposals (RFPs) being well defined, but the ARCC could use Broad Agency Announcements (BAAs) which utilize broad areas of interest. It was also pointed out the ARCC members are currently all DAU "insiders", and to expand its prestige, members from the Executive Institute or academia could provide a big multiplier. The funding baseline was presented to be \$500,000 or more. Lt. Gen. Ferguson questioned whether Small Business Innovative Research (SBIR) funding could be utilized. However, SBIR funding is currently product oriented.

**1530 - The DSMC Research Program** - Dr. Price presented the DSMC program as a result of the BoV requests for providing analysis of the research papers submitted in the past three acquisition research symposiums and to provide a status on "the stimulation of research initiative". Approximately 60 to 75 papers from 106 to 113 authors were presented at the 1993, 1995, and 1997 acquisition research symposiums. The breakout of authors from the 1997 symposium was presented. While the majority of papers were from within DoD (approximately 60%), papers were presented by representatives of other Federal government agencies, FFRDCs, Industry, and academia. Mr. Levi pointed out the majority of these papers were not "research". Even their titles suggested otherwise (i.e., "Status of ..."). Dr. Eaton stated a research agenda was lacking. There should be some delivery of "new" information to the acquisition workforce (practitioners). Mr. Levi pointed out some industry papers were nothing more than marketing presentations. Dr. Price continued outlining the DSMC research program whose purpose is to: provide high quality relevant research products to policy makers and the workforce, and conduct research and special studies directed toward improving the curricula and increasing the body of knowledge in defense acquisition management. The DSMC extramural research program would: call for topics from its customers and DSMC Board member organizations; assign a COTR, and utilize the DSMC Research Review Board to: cross reference the ROAR data base, select topics, and coordinate with the OSD Studies Office and the DAU Acquisition Research Coordinating Committee (ARCC), and select an extramural researcher. The purpose of the DSMC program is to get results to: policy makers, faculty and students, and the acquisition workforce. The results would be printed within government publications. Dr. Eaton and Dr. Gansler stated the research results should be widely published and reprinted in government media. Mr. Crean and Dr. Gansler stated there should not be two external research programs and its discussion would be taken up in the BoV Executive session. Lt. Gen. Ferguson suggested the Executive Institute could research the co-funding of projects with industry. Mr. Gallagher suggested that, to bring a different perspective to the acquisition research activity, the following names be added to the DSMC Research Review Board, and, as appropriate, the Acquisition Research Coordination Committee: Drs. David Cleland, Curtis Cook, and David Cleland. Mr. Crean agreed to solicit their participation.

**1600 - The DAU Distance Learning Initiative** - Mr. Will Peratino presented the "lessons learned" thus far in the process. The conversion status, as recently approved by the Technology-Based Education and Training Steering Committee, was presented. The evaluation results of the DAU online course are positive on content, interaction, learning approach, and test items stating Web-based training works. The DAU will continue to use interactive approaches while researching additional techniques. The Web development must be done on a server identical to the final computer environment and the DAU is contracting for dedicated servers. Teaching schedules are being coordinated with development schedules to allow for dedicated instructor time, because instructors must continue to teach during course development. Instructors must update course materials when evaluating courses for conversion, because current course materials designed for the classroom may not be immediately used in the technology-based training. Lt. Gen. Ferguson suggested a method to finance the course conversions by competing the development and allowing the winning contractor to charge royalties for the course usage. Lt. Gen. Ferguson also suggested students take courses on their own time. Dr. Gansler suggested the DAU look at alternative creative financing methods.

#### **1615 - BoV Executive Session**

##### **Resultant Actions/Issues/Highlights:**

Attending in addition to BoV members were Mr. Tom Crean, Ed Hirsch for DSMC, and LTC Brandy Johnson representing Dr. Jim McMichael.

1. Re-look and discuss again the continuing acquisition education policy. There needs to be a philosophical shift to acquisition education. If ICAF is mandatory for senior acquisition positions, must look at the relationship between ICAF and DAU. Must think in terms of continuous learning and look at motivation, incentives, rewards. Must provide a baseline for additional study of continuing learning.
2. Must look at incentives for military personnel to teach and how to make it career enhancing. Determine system for selecting or rejecting faculty candidates.
3. Have DACMS discuss getting right students to the right course at the right time. Policy on prerequisites to be coordinated by the Director, AET&CD.
4. Re-brief acquisition research as a single program under DAU, using Executive Institute visiting professors from outside schools, and the ARCC from within schools to evaluation requests and proposals. Look at using DSMC as executive agent but do not create a bureaucracy.
5. Look at creative means of financing distance learning. Use contacts in DARPA through the DARPA Chair (Ron Register) to discuss, with DARPA, ways to finance. Use Mr. Will Peratino as Program Manager.

**ATTENDEES**  
**Defense Acquisition University (DAU)**  
**Board of Visitors (BoV)**

Meeting Date: September 10, 1997

Place: Defense Systems Management College (DSMC), Building 184

**BoV**

Mr. Charles "Pete" Adolph  
Lt Gen Thomas Ferguson  
Dr. Lionel Baldwin

Dr. Gertrude Eaton  
Mr. James Gallagher

Dr. Jacques Gansler  
Mr. Eric Levi

Absent: Mr. Peter DeMayo and Mr. Donald Campbell

**DAU Office of the President**

Mr. Thomas Crean  
Mr. Bob Wolownik  
LTC R. Alan Gregory  
Mr. Will Peratino

Mr. Frank Sobieszczyk  
Dr. Lenore Sack  
Mr. Joe Wargo

**DoD**

Ms. Donna Richbourg  
Dr. Patricia Sanders  
Mr. Joe Diamond  
LtCol. Brandy Johnson

Dr. James McMichael  
Ms. Jeanne Carney  
Ms. Marlu Vance  
Mr. Steve Cohen

Mr. W. Hauenstein  
Mr. Skip Hawthorne  
Ms. Joni Forman  
Ms. Anne Ryan

**DSMC**

Mr. Edward Hirsch  
Dr. Jack Dwyer  
Mr. Tony Kausel  
Mr. Richard Reed  
Mr. Dave Scibetta

Dr. James Price  
Col. John Lawless  
Major Luis Ramirez  
Mr. Ron Register  
Mr. Cal Brown

Col. Sam Brown  
Col. Chuck Westrip  
Mr. G. Kirkorian  
CAPT R. Vernon

**Consortium Schools**

Dr. Linda Brandt  
Dr. Richard Graham  
Ms. Shari Durand  
Col. Charles Golla

Dr. Dave Whipple  
Ms. Barbara Mroczkowski  
Dr. Rich Murphy  
Col. Neal Ely

Dr. Jerry Smith  
Mr. Joe Burton  
Dr. John Matherne

6. Explain how ARCC products are integrated into the curriculum.

1650 **Adjourn**

DECISION:

Approved: Thomas M. Allen

for Chairman, DAU BoV  
Disapproved: \_\_\_\_\_

Other: \_\_\_\_\_