

Integrated Training and Education Workshop



Issue Paper No. 2008-01

By COL Morgan M. Lamb

“Developing the Decision Makers of Tomorrow”

PURPOSE

The United States Army Peacekeeping and Stability Operations Institute (PKSOI), in conjunction with the Department of States Coordinator for Reconstruction and Stabilization (S/CRS), Consortium for Complex Operations (CCO), United States Institute for Peace (USIP), U.S. Army Combined Arms Center (CAC) and The Naval Post Graduate School (NPS) hosted the third Integrated Training and Education Workshop on SO. The workshop provided an opportunity for practitioners to share and assist one another as they develop and refine curriculum and content to train and educate their employees. The basis for discussions was doctrine and policies that are emerging as a result of the publication of the U.S. Army’s Field Manual (FM) 3-07 Stability Operations, decisions from the Sub-Policy Coordinating Committee (Sub-PCC) on training and educating the Civilian Stabilization Initiative (CSI) and the whole of government, and various academic initiatives.

This workshop brought together trainers and educators from the U.S. Government (USG), international organizations (IO’s) and non-governmental organizations (NGO’s), and select private and military educational institutions to present current core curriculum content, concepts, and tools to understand approaches and determine gaps. This comparative analysis will enhance the curriculum throughout the larger community that is dealing with professional leader training and education programs. There were four objectives for the workshop:

- Understand the commonalities and differences among various approaches toward training and educating SO.
- Identify and share best practices of pedagogical tools.
- Identify gaps in curriculum, content and methodology and develop solutions.
- Establish strategic partnerships to share content and ideas.

BACKGROUND

The August 2006 Integrated Education Workshop, hosted at GMU with PKSOI, NPS, National Defense University (NDU), USIP, and S/CRS, provided a forum to examine processes for creating synergies among current education efforts, identify best practices, and provide recommendations to improve peace, stability, and reconstruction operation education programs. In 2007, the Education and Training Workshop sponsored by the same stakeholders provided valuable insights and inputs for the National Security Professional Development (NSPD) implementation plan. It developed

the following: an education packet for our senior leaders to assist them in understanding the types and capabilities of organizations involved in SO, a comprehensive outreach strategy to engage civilian universities and the legislative branch of the USG; and recommended that S/CRS review the possible addition of education as a component of the Sub-PCC under the Reconstruction and Stabilization PCC.

By October 2008, S/CRS will receive funding and will start their educational initiatives supporting CSI. The U.S. Army published FM 3-07 Stability Operations October 2008, establishing overarching doctrinal guidance and direction for conducting stability operations that will influence the U.S. Army Education System. The NPS Graduate Institute's certificate initiative on stability will be in full development. This working group session supported all of these emerging initiatives.

WORKSHOP DESIGN AND OBJECTIVES

This workshop was conducted over the course of three days. The focus for Day One was a series of briefings and discussions provided by selected speakers about representative curriculum. Day Two focused on four breakout groups: 1) Principles and Methods, 2) Tools, 3) Solutions and Strategic Alliances, and 4) Content and Delivery Mechanisms. On Day Three, the breakout groups finalized their efforts, and presented findings and recommendations to all workshop participants.

There were four objectives for the workshop: 1. Understand the commonalities and differences among various approaches toward training and educating SO. 2. Identify and share best practices of pedagogical tools. 3. Identify gaps in curriculum, content, methodology and develop solutions. 4. Establish strategic partnerships to share content and ideas.

PARTICIPANTS

There were 78 workshop participants who came from a broad spectrum of organizations involved in SO training and education. The exchange between individuals, representing many diverse organizational cultures, ensured a rich and lively discussion of the requirements and approaches needed to provide individual and collective training for current and future SO practitioners.

PRESENTATIONS

The conference began with a series of background briefings to provide attendees updates on the status of HQDA's SO action plan, the S/CRS status and way ahead, an overview of CCO's Gap Analysis that was used as baseline for the breakout group discussions, and curriculum overviews from a variety of training and education institutions.

The following agencies and organizations provided background briefings:

- Headquarters Department of Army (HQDA)
- Office of the Coordinator for Reconstruction and Stabilization (S/CRS)
- Consortium for Complex Operations (CCO)
- U.S. Army Peacekeeping and Stability Operations Institute (PKSOI)
- Foreign Service Institute (FSI)

- U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID)
- George Mason University (GMU)
- Naval Postgraduate School (NPS)
- James Madison University (JMU)
- Eastern Mennonite University (EMU)
- U.S. Institute of Peace (USIP)
- U.S. Army Command and General Staff College (CGSC)
- Joint Center for International Security Force Assistance (JCISFA)
- George C. Marshall Center
- Catholic Relief Services
- Canadian Staff College

BREAKOUT SESSIONS

General Problem Statement for Breakout Groups:

How do we develop curricula for educating and/or training individuals to function in a complex operation that address the challenges of these environments, particularly the need for interaction among organizations with differing attitudes, behaviors, cultures, values systems, requirements, and goals?

Breakout Groups will:

1. Use the CCO/USIP Gap Analysis study as a point of departure to build upon.
2. Refine and/or identify potential research topics and adjust and/or add to the 2008 and 2009 research topic lists.
3. Work to capture strategic partnerships that can facilitate follow-on actions to resolve gaps and define a way forward.
4. Capture best practices that practitioners have discovered and identify where there is no path ahead to rectify a gap.
5. Criteria for Analysis: when evaluating the gaps, the breakout groups will identify the constraints specifically inherent to:
 - Academia
 - Training, professional development, readiness, pre-deployment
 - In-theater continuity training
 - Audience experience levels
 - Constant evolution of the complex operations field of study

Breakout Group 1: Methods and Principles - Facilitated by GMU and PKSOI. A comparative analysis of basic pedagogical principles and methods focused on best practices as curriculums are applied to specific target audiences (senior leaders, mid-level) and experience levels. The group looked at the impact of time (crisis vs. deliberate) on an educational construct, as well as the advantages of classroom vice distance educational curriculum. The group developed a list of best practice pedagogical principles based on specified needs and desired outcomes.

Critical Questions: How does the diversity of organizations engaged in complex operations affect the choice and application of pedagogical principles and methods in training and education?

Breakout Group 2: Tools - Facilitated by S/CRS and PKSOI. A list of best practice tools utilized in curriculum support; such as specific case studies, simulations, or historical example. The group compiled a list of best practice tools for collaboration and distribution post workshop.

Critical Questions: What tools best support complex operations training and education? What tools can most impact interactions and stereotypes held by students? How can we use tools to shape and integrate the whole of government approaches to complex operations?

Breakout Group 3: Solutions and Strategic Alliances - Facilitated by CCO and PKSOI. The group reviewed the gaps in course offerings and the recommendations listed in the CCO study and expanded this list to incorporate any gaps that were not captured. The group then analyzed the comprehensive list and identified strategic partnerships to implement the recommended solutions.

Critical Questions: What are the curriculum gaps in complex operations? What are solutions to those gaps? What strategic partnerships can best address them? Are there content areas that receive too much attention?

Breakout Group 4: Content & Delivery Mechanisms - Facilitated by USIP and PKSOI. This group explored two dimensions of the challenges involved in developing "integrated training and education" for complex operations: First, how can training and education programs best be integrated into complex operations, both before and during deployments to the field? Second, how can training and education programs help better integrate the efforts of the wide range of governmental, intergovernmental, and nongovernmental organizations that are frequently operating in the same space during complex operations? The group discussed strategies for optimizing both the content and modes of delivery of training and education programs to support these objectives.

Critical Questions: How can training and education programs best help staff (both within and across organizational boundaries) develop a common operating picture of complex environments? How can training and education programs best support efforts to conduct integrated capacity assessments, as well as program planning and coordination? How can lessons learned and best practices based on field experiences best be communicated to designers of training and education programs; and how can relevant lessons be communicated back to other staff members in the field? Should new databases along the lines of USIP's International Network to Promote the Rule of Law (INPROL) be established in order to foster interactive learning? To what extent is it desirable and/or feasible to create a common "training space" for staff members of diverse organizations, (e.g., governments, IOs, NGOs) both before and during deployments to the field?

KEY FINDINGS

Through the work of the breakout groups, the following recommendations were carried forward:

- Training and education strategies need to be developed so that the entire community can move ahead in a collaborative manner. The community of practice should be understood as including not only DoD and USG civilian

agencies, but also IOs, NGOs and HN governmental and nongovernmental actors. To serve this goal, training programs should be conceived not as a discrete phase of preparation prior to deployment to the field, but as an ongoing element of joint mission planning and operations in the field.

- Implement Senior Leader Education. DoS S/CRS along with other lead agencies should direct the effort to implement Senior Leader (SES and two-star) Education programs as outlined in the conference final report.
- Refine and institutionalize the ongoing work (e.g., existing frameworks inserted in curricula—U.S. Industrial College of the Armed Forces, Interagency Planning Frameworks, Essential Task Matrix,). This includes the development of the conceptual understanding of the political dimension underlying stability operations and the tradecraft of shepherding political process from local to national level; the integration of frameworks into multiple simulation exercises and immersive scenarios; and the development of an interagency catalog of exercises.
- Consider more individual development programs, on-line certifications, and Experiential Constructive Simulation Exercises (ICSE-civilian) that use virtual worlds.
- Establish searchable repositories: course catalogs, case studies, frameworks, virtual world role playing, U.S. Army Combat Training Centers (CTC) cultural awareness templates, and student-developed case studies.
- Explore the utility of the virtual collaborative classroom that can facilitate relationship building networking, exercising, virtual reach-back, blogging, and research sources for NGOs and for-profit organizations.
- Establish a community process for knowledge management that includes a integrated database search engine.
- Provide top-down leadership and direction for the effort by Deputies Committee or Principles Committee. The TE3 and Civilian Military Activity Review Team (CMART) need to be used so that a Common Operating Picture (COP) is possible.
- Resurrect a U.S. Information Agency like capacity. Strategic Leadership and Guidance is required.
- Disseminate whole of government planning concepts. Current lack of knowledge results in inconsistencies in the application and the doctrine.

PKSOI Issue Paper No. 2008-01
Stability Operations Training and Education Project

- Focus on civilian-led exercises with the military in support. The mindset in complex operations is too security focused.
- Increase the training in project management for stability operations.
- Educate on how to lead an interagency team.
- Focus on Situational and Cultural Awareness.
- Increase the knowledge of local systems and the awareness of policy makers of the role of the Host Nation in local capacity building.
- Ensure that contractors' lessons are captured. Captured lessons must be applied to inform, educate and train.
- Increase understanding of public diplomacy's role in complex operations. Develop strategic communication education and training for senior leaders.
- Conduct periodic IA training in a neutral setting. Review parallel development of IMS (Interagency Management System) and DoD's Civilian Expeditionary Workforce (CEW). Train to multiple scenarios before deploying into the area of operations. Train at multiple levels of the organization. Link the Stability Operations (SO) training to National Security Presidential Directive (NSPD) requirements.

WAY AHEAD

In collaboration with stakeholders, PKSOI will assess the progress of the recommendations made above. PKSOI will convene periodic telephonic meetings of the stakeholders to see what might be needed to propel these recommendations forward. The next workshop is scheduled for Oct 26-30 2009.