



## Building Partner-Nation Capacity Through the Defense Education Enhancement Program

*Alan G. Stolberg, Stuart E. Johnson, Laura Kupe*

The world has become more complex and interconnected. Emerging challenges—ranging from terrorist attacks to cyber intrusions by state and nonstate actors—have dramatically shaped the state of global security. As a result, the education and training of members of the armed forces have become increasingly important in preparing future military leaders, whose key responsibilities include the security and stability of the nations they serve.

In response to these new challenges, defense education practitioners have promoted multinational and multistakeholder training in defense education institutions.<sup>1</sup> The United States, working in close cooperation with North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) headquarters, has signaled the importance of defense education in its engagement with a number of former Soviet Union states and NATO partner nations of interest through the creation of the Defense Education Enhancement Program (DEEP). Office of the Secretary of Defense (OSD) and

NATO funding sources have supported DEEP since 2007, a key initiative of the Partnership for Peace Consortium (PfPC). The PfPC, through U.S. Department of Defense's (DoD's) George C. Marshall Center—European Center for Security Studies, is the program's executive agent and closely coordinates with the NATO International Staff. Founded in 1999 during the NATO summit in Washington, D.C., PfPC was specifically chartered to promote defense education within the context of overall defense institution building in addition to fostering regional stability.

### **What Is the Defense Education Enhancement Program?**

DEEP aims to support the professionalization of partner-nation defense education institutions and assist in their national preparation for interoperability with, and potential integration into, NATO operations. NATO supports DEEP initiatives with partner-nation professional military education (PME) schools in coordination with PfPC academies and security studies institutes

and select partnership training and education centers, as well as with key allies and partner-defense education institutions.<sup>2</sup> DEEP is open to all countries associated with the NATO Partnership for Peace program<sup>3</sup> and has extended its reach to a number of other countries, including Tunisia and Mauritania (members of the Mediterranean Dialogue)<sup>4</sup>; Iraq, under the rubric of the “Structured Cooperation Framework”<sup>5</sup>; and Afghanistan in the context of the “Enduring Partnership.”<sup>6</sup>

Prior to 2007, there was no precedent for any concrete action plan to aid former Warsaw Pact nations and Soviet Socialist Republics (SSRs) in professional military education. The 2004 Partnership Action Plan for Defense Institution Building (PAP-DIB) offered a potential way forward. Sparked by the annual NATO conference for partner nations in early 2006, an ad hoc group of NATO officials comprising U.S., Canadian, and Swiss educators and the faculty of the Marshall Center gathered as “Friends of PAP-DIB” and developed the foundation for DEEP. There was strong consensus among these defense educators that DEEP was feasible and worth supporting.

The PfPC at the Marshall Center was a key organizer of Friends of PAP-DIB discussions. NATO headquarters needed an official interlocutor to assemble PME experts to explore outreach to the partner nations. The Marshall Center, sensing the value in reaching out to partner educators, was enthusiastic about taking

---

*The ultimate goal for partner nations through DEEP participation is to contribute to the overall professionalization of their armed forces.*

on the role. The Marshall Center and its team of academics also needed an official point of entry to approach interested partner nations, and NATO’s PAP-DIB proved ideal for this purpose. NATO’s use of PAP-DIB to gain official, top-down support for improved PME and DEEP’s bottom-up marshalling of committed subject-matter experts (SMEs) willing to offer their time and expertise have been key components of the program.

Since its initial launch in Kazakhstan in 2007, the program has supported defense education institutions in 16 different countries: Afghanistan, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Croatia, Georgia, Iraq, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Macedonia, Mauritania, Moldova, Mongolia, Serbia, Tunisia, Ukraine, and Uzbekistan. The Croatia program, the only one for a NATO member, has successfully concluded having fulfilled all objectives, and the program in Iraq was suspended for the foreseeable future because of the fighting that emerged in 2014 and the associated closing of all Iraqi PME institutions. A new DEEP project for Kyrgyzstan was initiated in early 2017. With the exceptions of Croatia and Iraq, all other DEEP projects are ongoing.

### **What Does the Defense Education Enhancement Program Do and How Does It Do It?**

DEEP seeks to develop the PME capacity of partner nations through peer-to-peer collaboration, curriculum, and faculty development focused on providing modern teaching methodologies to partner PME schools. The ultimate goal for partner nations through DEEP participation is to contribute to the overall professionalization of their armed forces by improving their respective military education systems through the exposure to and potential adoption of Euro-Atlantic military education models.

DEEP was designed to be a demand-driven initiative in which action plans are built to meet the needs of the partner nations' military leadership and PME institutions. The action or cooperation plan is individually tailored for each partner school and developed for an initial two- to three-year period. At the heart of these plans are the key instrumentalities of each DEEP initiative: curriculum and faculty development. Underlying the engagement between DEEP SMEs and partner nations is the added exposure to Euro-Atlantic defense educators who are free to propose new approaches. Volunteer educators from national PME schools lead DEEP teams, with the endorsement of their home PME institutions. The United States and NATO pay travel and other related expenses for educators. DEEP also works closely with NATO International Staff; each partner nation's NATO Individual Partnership Action Plan (IPAP) outlines top-down guidance on how to bring about institutional change in their respective PME systems.<sup>7</sup> Similarly, the PfPC and OSD cooperate closely.<sup>8</sup>

PfPC officials quickly learned three things in the early stages of DEEP. First, the development of solid curricula (what to teach), rooted in accepted instructional principles, is critical to the transformation of partner-nation defense institutions.<sup>9</sup> Second, improving human capital in the form of faculty development (how to teach) is crucial in sustaining institutional change and reform. Third, the peer-to-peer administration and management-

---

*DEEP was designed to be a demand-driven initiative in which action plans are built to meet the needs of the partner nations' military leadership and PME institutions.*

support aspect of the program brings a holistic approach to defense education transformation that DEEP seeks to implement.

DEEP also conducts annual qualitative reviews to assess and measure the advancements that have been made in any supported partner school, in addition to documenting any challenges. The PfPC Education Development Working Group (EDWG), NATO International Staff, and academic leads for each DEEP country also note the progress made during the course of the program in strategic plans, which establish next steps for subsequent DEEP engagement.

DEEP SMEs, who are experts in the key areas of curriculum development, faculty development, and advising and mentorship, are also critical to the running of DEEP. To be a curriculum-development SME, a candidate has typically taught the subject, has developed curricula for the subject, or has published articles or books on the topic. Optimally, a faculty-development pedagogy specialist is someone who has either chosen to specialize in training other faculty in how to teach at their PME school or has a university degree in a relevant subject, such as adult education or instructional technology. These efforts of U.S. and European academic SMEs in DEEP have led to varying degrees of reform and institutional change in partner-nation defense education institutions.

DEEP academic SMEs provide their expertise on a volunteer basis and are only reimbursed for travel expenses. This academic peer-to-peer element of DEEP in particular has made this initiative relatively inexpensive. The costs are borne by both the U.S. and NATO International Staff funds, each contributing a roughly equal amount to DEEP SME travel costs. On the U.S. side, DoD uses the Wales Initiative Fund, which was designed to enhance partner-

---

*Initiatives such as DEEP are also of particular value to NATO and the United States as unique security cooperation tools to influence partnerships with states outside of the traditional Euro-Atlantic community.*

nation capacity and advance the democratic reform of defense establishments and military forces. It focuses on defense institution building (DIB) efforts in partner countries.<sup>10</sup> NATO International Staff employs alliance-derived funding sources. Finally, partner nations sometime provide in-kind contributions for the visiting SMEs, such as hosting meals or paying for the local lodging.

### **Why Is the Defense Education Enhancement Program Valuable to Partner Nations, the United States, and NATO?**

DEEP was constructed to be a demand-driven initiative in which action plans are developed to meet the needs of the partner nations' military leadership and PME institutions. The United States and NATO also view the value of such programs as relatively inexpensive ways to catalyze long-term positive change in partner countries, thereby furthering U.S. national interests associated with security and stability. Furthermore, education can transform institutions because it can contribute to more "reasoned decisions and strategies during NATO operations, better leadership, and ultimately a region at peace, especially when multinational operations are becoming more commonplace."<sup>11</sup>

The NATO International Staff's involvement in developing each partner nation's IPAP serves as a mandate for defense education institutions in partner nations to commit to the goals outlined in the plan. The senior-level support for such a plan ensures that partner nations are committed to working with DEEP to implement the goals and principles associated with the priorities of the Euro-Atlantic community.

Initiatives such as DEEP are also of particular value to NATO and the United States as unique security cooperation tools to influence partnerships with states outside of the traditional Euro-Atlantic community. NATO has grown to 28 nations from the original 12 member states, thus enlarging NATO's capabilities, commitments, and challenges.<sup>12</sup> In recent years, NATO has welcomed allies from Central and Eastern Europe, and the alliance's heads of state and government at the 2004 Istanbul Summit agreed that "in enhancing the Euro-Atlantic Partnership, [they] would put special focus on engaging with partners in the strategically important regions of the [South] Caucasus and Central Asia."<sup>13</sup> This eastward shift is visible in DEEP, in which a number of these Eurasian countries participate.

As more DEEP partner nations move toward the overall professionalization of their PME systems to become better versed in the Euro-Atlantic model of military education, the long-term potential for increased and combined operations with NATO is likely to benefit stabilization and crisis-management efforts. Interoperability is seen as vital in the eyes of NATO "to set common references, doctrines, and approaches to problem solving that would allow officers from different backgrounds to understand

---

## *DEEP's goals are also associated with objectives outlined in the 2015 National Military Strategy.*

each other.”<sup>14</sup> Moreover, NATO and the United States have a profound interest in building partner-nation capacity to minimize global threats, contribute to coalition operations, and sustain regional stability in their respective parts of the world.<sup>15</sup>

Stronger PME systems can support the attainment of these ends. Over time, well-written and well-taught curricula can overcome the deficiencies in Soviet/Russian PME embedded in the former SSRs. A career-long hierarchy of transformative junior, staff, and senior officer courses can lead to acceptance of civil control of the military and the rule of law; transparency in budgeting; respect for human rights; and, perhaps most important, skill in critical thinking. PME in Western nations are built on these principles. DEEP can produce a more-professional officer corps that shares and supports these same values and goals.

As delineated in the two most recent National Security Strategy (NSS) documents published in 2010 and 2015, the three national interests most relevant to DEEP are

- “the security of the United States, its citizens, and U.S. allies and partners”
- “respect for universal values at home and around the world”
- a “rules-based international order” advanced by U.S. leadership “that promotes peace, security, and opportunity through stronger cooperation to meet global challenges.”<sup>16</sup>

The connection of DEEP priorities to U.S. national-level strategic objectives is also evident in DoD’s 2012 Strategic Guidance, which supports the NSS. At the departmental level of the executive branch, DoD notes that

[t]he United States must continue to promote regional security and Euro-Atlantic integration. The United States has enduring interests in supporting peace and prosperity in Europe as well as bolstering the strength and vitality of NATO, which is critical to the security of Europe and beyond. . . . Building partnership capacity elsewhere in the world also remains important for sharing the costs and responsibilities of global leadership.<sup>17</sup>

DEEP’s goals are also associated with objectives outlined in the 2015 National Military Strategy. This strategy stresses “the security, confidence, and reliability of [its] allies . . . and the preservation and extension of universal values.”<sup>18</sup> Moreover, the strategy identifies that “central to these efforts is strengthening our global network of allies and partners.”<sup>19</sup>

As part of the DIB process, DEEP is a tool through which partner-nation defense education institutions can independently sustain themselves through the orchestration of a PME system without U.S. and NATO security cooperation or assistance. Through its effect on people, defense education is the intellectual and enduring basis of DIB. By ensuring that successive generations of defense and security personnel are endowed with the requisite skills, knowledge, and attributes, defense education enables DIB to gain strength and resilience over time. Defense education is thus integral to the development and pursuit of professional excellence within defense and security institutions.

---

*OSD's investment in programs for capacity building and defense institution building, such as DEEP, warrants a review to assess whether such programs advance U.S. national security interests.*

### **Focus of and Approach to This Perspective**

As explained in detail in the next section, in 2016, the collective group of DEEP experts assessed the effectiveness of the program in 11 of the 13 active DEEP countries: Afghanistan, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, Kazakhstan, Mauritania, Moldova, Mongolia, Serbia, Ukraine, and Uzbekistan. The group also developed a strategic plan to document each partner nation's specific goals and priorities. Of the two additional DEEP-supported nations, Tunisia was excluded from review because of the lack of U.S. participation in DEEP efforts there, and Iraq did not receive a review because the program had been suspended during the course of the ongoing fighting against the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant and resulting closure of all Iraqi PME institutions.

The project team within the RAND Corporation's National Defense Research Institute has substantial experience in defense education and security cooperation in general and DEEP in particular. The three authors of this Perspective have participated in the assessment of DEEP: Alan Stolberg has participated in the program since its inception and, since 2013, has served as its coordinator. Stuart Johnson has conducted research on security cooperation, including DEEP, and oversees RAND's support of the program. As part of RAND's DEEP team, Laura Kupe has

specifically reviewed the recent DEEP reports and strategic plans to prepare material for this Perspective.

The team reviewed DEEP reports and strategic plans to supplement and broaden our personal experiences with DEEP. In preparing this Perspective, the authors asked the following three motivating questions:

- Has the support from DEEP caused partner nations to do things differently in their defense education institutions?
- Are these partners moving closer to Euro-Atlantic standards and values in terms of curriculum and faculty development as a result of DEEP initiatives?
- What lessons have the authors and the DEEP participants learned about the most-effective ways to support partner nations in modernizing their PME institutions?

### **Efforts to Document and Measure the Effectiveness of DEEP Programs**

OSD's investment in programs for capacity building and defense institution building, such as DEEP, warrants a review to assess whether such programs advance U.S. national security interests.

At the end of 2016—as had been done in the previous three years—PfPC EDWG academic SMEs associated with DEEP, along with the NATO International Staff, assessed the changes that occurred after each DEEP activity by relying on their observations of partner-nation PME school activities, discussions with partner-nation counterparts, and their subject-matter expertise.<sup>20</sup> The focus of the assessments in each annual DEEP measures of effectiveness (MOE) report was on the actual outcome of the individual DEEP projects and their effect on partner-nation educational institutions

and not on describing the overall DEEP country program or support activities that took place.

The primary assessment tool guiding the EDWG and NATO International Staff during their review was the question: “What did/does the partner nation school do differently as a result of the DEEP effort?”<sup>21</sup> DEEP reviewers measure the effectiveness of each DEEP project by observing changes in internal academic processes, faculty improvement, and curriculum development adaptation. Analyses during the annual review conducted by the DEEP leads of each program address each event that took place in the previous 12 months with the partner-school leadership, with the intent to determine what changes came about as a result of DEEP activities or events.

Examples of change include observing whether faculty in partner nations employ DEEP curriculum recommendations and whether this information becomes a component of a newly introduced multihour course. When possible, the DEEP leads also monitor activities in a partner-school class to observe teacher conduct; reviews are usually done in a one-hour period in a partner-school course. The leads look for the use of modern teaching methodologies, such as whether faculty are just reading notes or lecturing verbatim from slides, whether faculty engage

with the students by asking questions, and whether students are asking the faculty questions.

### **Measures of Effectiveness Report**

The annual DEEP MOE report in Table 1 outlines eight categories that identify the varying levels of DEEP’s effect on partner nations. Change in these categories in an individual PME school demonstrates that the partner nation has done things differently in its respective defense education institution. This would be the case when a new school, course, and/or lesson curriculum is created, as well as when the faculty employ teaching methodologies intended to catalyze student critical thinking. The same can be said for new curriculum and faculty development for noncommissioned officer (NCO) education. These types of changes can lead to partner-nation adaptation of certain Euro-Atlantic defense education–related standards and values. These adaptations would be reflected in new courses such as those addressing civil-military relations or leadership. The changes would also be demonstrated in a new faculty-development focus intended to emphasize creative and innovative student thinking. The categories and their definitions were first developed by EDWG members in fall 2013 and has since been refined annually by the same group. The 2016 DEEP MOE categories and detailed definitions are shown in Table 1.<sup>22</sup>

---

*DEEP reviewers measure the effectiveness of each DEEP project by observing changes in internal academic processes, faculty improvement, and curriculum development adaptation.*

TABLE 1

## Categories of DEEP Influence on Partner Nations

Categories	Definitions
Adoption of modern PME academic structures and degree requirements	Partner-country or individual partner PME institution creates modern academic institutions (e.g., creation of an entirely new academic institution such as pre-commissioning school or staff college; separation of war college and staff college courses into two distinct entities) or develops degree programs (e.g., undergraduate or graduate) in accordance with internationally recognized criteria (e.g., Bologna Process <sup>24</sup> ). This would include support for an accreditation process to ensure alignment with the Bologna Process. This could also include the adoption of advanced distributed learning (distance or online learning) programs for the first time and adoption of administrative and managerial procedures.
Inclusion of modern subject matter into existing course curricula to include development of entirely new courses	Individual partner PME institution adapts modern subject matter derived from DEEP curriculum development events and places them into separate lessons or entire courses.
Adoption of modern teaching methodologies by PME faculty	Individual partner-nation PME institution adapts modern teaching methodologies into the seminar room (e.g., emphasis on critical-thinking skills using the Socratic method of questioning students and creating an atmosphere where the students are comfortable to challenge the faculty member). This would also include the partner-nation PME institution adoption and creation of its own faculty development programs.
Adoption of NCO education	Partner nation creates new modern NCO academic education/training institutions or existing partner-nation NCO academic/training institutions adapt Western-oriented subject matter derived from DEEP curriculum development events and places into separate lessons or entire courses. This could also involve the adoption by the individual partner-nation NCO PME institution of modern teaching methodologies into the classroom.
Support of senior partner-nation and defense education institution leadership for programs relating to PfPC DEEP	Senior-level partner-nation government officials, including the ministers of defense, deputy ministers of defense, chiefs of defense, and defense education institution leadership, express support for programs relating to DEEP.
Contribution of partner-nation educators and NCO experts (military and civilian) in programs relating to PfPC DEEP	Partner-nation educators assume the external contributor role and (not only the internal recipient role) for PfPC support.
Contribution to strategic goals	DEEP components directly relate to NATO and U.S. strategic goals for relations with the partner nation through NATO and partners' partnership-cooperation programs. DEEP objectives are identified, measured, and amended through written requests of partner ministries of defense to NATO, and progress is captured in the assessment of these programs. DEEP components contribute strongly to the achievement of the NATO/PfPC PAP-DIB initiative launched at the 2004 Istanbul Summit, and education and training for defense reform agreed by NATO allies and partners in 2006.
Contribution to meeting partner requirements and goals	DEEP components enable partners to achieve requirements/goals that they have established to attain designated objectives related to the professionalization of their armed forces and external relations with NATO and the United States.

## Strategic Plans

With the United States serving as a major financial contributor to DEEP, U.S. strategic objectives are incorporated into each partner-nation strategic plan. These plans provide a guideline for partner-nation and DEEP SMEs to engage in implementing agreed-on priorities. These strategic plans receive input from each regional combatant command with planning responsibility for respective partner nations, which, in the case of DEEP, includes the U.S. European, U.S. Central, U.S. Pacific, and U.S. Africa Commands.

U.S. priorities are most visible in the mission, vision, goals, and U.S. and NATO intent sections of the strategic plans in each DEEP. The following is a summary of these sections—which vary depending on each partner-nation’s priorities—highlighting key DEEP and overall U.S. objectives:

- The mission details the specific outcomes that the DEEP initiative seeks to achieve in that country. This category also names specific PME institutions in partner nations where DEEP efforts will be targeted. The mission statement for each partner nation is drafted to promote the transformation of faculty and curriculum development processes so that they eventually develop their own capabilities to orchestrate their defense education institutions without external assistance. The vision outlines DEEP’s overall purpose, which is to assist partner nations in moving toward the overall professionalization of their armed forces and PME systems to increase the long-term potential for increased and combined operations with NATO.
- The goals highlight the key instrumentalities in each DEEP project: development of curricula (what to teach), development

---

*With the United States serving as a major financial contributor to DEEP, U.S. strategic objectives are incorporated into each partner-nation strategic plan.*

of faculty (how to teach), and the provision of advice (peer-to-peer support on the administration and management of defense education institutions). Again, the specific goals for each partner nation are linked to the mission that is also articulated in the strategic plans.

- The U.S. and NATO intent further captures the focus that the United States and NATO have on the overall professionalization of DEEP partner-nation militaries and guiding defense institutions toward the adoption of professional Euro-Atlantic norms.

## Selected DEEP Program Accomplishments

There have been different levels of progress in partner-nation defense education institutions across the 11 countries. The DEEP concept of PME change is a long-term process for a nation in general and for an academic organization specifically. This professionalization process could be characterized as inherently slow-moving given the institutional changes that need to take place. It has taken years to establish new defense education institutions or courses, and, in some cases, DEEP SME observers have expected progress to require potentially many more years of support.<sup>24</sup> Factors, such as internal political dynamics or conditions within senior-level defense and other government institutions, can affect how quickly a PME system transforms. Given the unique

---

*Once a DEEP component is considered to have attained capacity—defined as no longer requiring a consistent program of DEEP support events—that program transitions to a sustainment phase.*

dynamics within each partner nation, reforms consequently occur at different rates and in varying degrees.

As noted, PfPC EDWG experts and NATO International Staff have qualitatively evaluated the effectiveness of DEEP initiatives. Since late 2013, they have reviewed the publication of the annual MOE report, assessing the changes in internal academic administrative and managerial processes, use of modern teaching methodologies, and adoption of new or improved curricula. Movement toward PME and the adoption of Euro-Atlantic models of military education has occurred in all 11 DEEP countries addressed in the annual report. The ultimate goal of participation in DEEP is for partner nations to become self-sufficient in managing their own PME institutions. Countries such as Kazakhstan and Moldova are already in position to conclude components of their participation in the program after years of DEEP engagement as program recipients.<sup>25</sup>

Once a DEEP component is considered to have attained capacity—defined as no longer requiring a consistent program of DEEP support events—that program transitions to a sustainment phase. This phase typically includes an invitation for such partner nations to begin serving as DEEP providers, where their PME schools willingly send their own SMEs to participate as active

contributors in the DEEP framework as well as hosting DEEP events in their countries. This development in particular speaks to the underlying collaborative nature of the program and the peer-to-peer interactions that already exist with Euro-Atlantic defense educators. For example, Afghanistan, Armenia, Georgia, Kazakhstan, and Moldova all have provided educators to lend their expertise to DEEP and other partner nations.

The ownership and leadership that these partner nations have developed in this regard speaks to the growing capacities that these nations have already built to manage their defense education institutions and staffs. DEEP aims to adopt such steps so that these countries ultimately can meet their own security needs and contribute to regional and international security more effectively.

Partner nations emphasize that they are committed to the overall professionalization of their armed forces and PME institutions and thus support a long-term process. Table 2 highlights how individual partner nations have been successful in adapting DEEP support in the eight categories outlined in the 2016 annual MOE report.

In summary, Table 2 outlines numerous instances of substantial modification that DEEP was able to support in a number of NATO partner-country PME institutions. Ranging from the creation of new schools, entire courses, individual lessons, and approaches to teaching, along with demonstrated support of both allied and partner political goals, DEEP has been able to cultivate real change through the DIB process. In each identified example, change has taken place for a given PME school. New courses were created with the development of the Armenian command and staff course, the master's degree program in the

TABLE 2

## Highlights of DEEP Accomplishments

Action	Accomplishment
Adoption of modern PME academic structures and degree requirements	<p><u>Armenia</u>: With the support of DEEP, the Armenian Military Education Concept was adopted in 2010, and the first Armenian command and staff course was inaugurated by the Armenian minister of defense (MOD) in September 2013. In 2017, the MOD head of education and human resources told DEEP observers that the command and staff course was meeting Armenian requirements and that there no longer was a need to send students to Russia.<sup>26</sup></p> <p><u>Azerbaijan</u>: At the recommendation of DEEP to improve course rigor, the Military College of the Armed Forces has worked with the ministry of education to accredit its work with a nationally accredited master's degree. This entails the writing of an extensive master's thesis and taking state-certified exams in a number of subjects.<sup>27</sup></p>
Inclusion of modern subject matter into existing course curricula, including development of entirely new courses	<p><u>Afghanistan</u>: Courses on civilian oversight of the armed forces and interagency coordination have been created and are now being taught at the Mongolian National Defense University (MNDU).<sup>28</sup></p> <p><u>Mongolia</u>: A new modern Mongolian staff officer course has been created and serves as the primary instrument for DEEP-supported change at the MNDU. The MNDU reported that it had attained self-sustaining and autonomous capacity to teach and evaluated this course in its second iteration in 2016.<sup>29</sup></p> <p><u>Kazakhstan</u>: DEEP has collaborated with the Kazakhstan National Defense University to develop complete multihour courses on Western operational art, logistics, and civil-military relations. Work has begun on the creation of a fourth Kazakhstan National Defense University course on special operations, with a projected summer 2018 pilot course start date.<sup>30</sup></p>
Adoption of modern teaching methodologies by PME faculty	<p><u>Kazakhstan</u>: Between 2008 and 2011, faculty development pedagogy events had a positive influence on the Kazakhstan National Defense University (KNDU) faculty. DEEP experts in June 2016 observed students being encouraged by the instructor to ask questions of the instructor and of one another, which marks a shift from the top-down, teacher-centered approach to education that previously dominated instruction at the university. As a result, there is no longer a requirement for educator workshop faculty development events at the KNDU.<sup>31</sup></p> <p><u>Uzbekistan</u>: DEEP has observed significant changes made by the Armed Forces Academy (AFA) in how they plan their lessons as well as run their lectures in the adoption of the experiential learning model and a paradigm to maximize student participation and long-term learning. A marked change has taken place in both instruction and student participation, as demonstrated by students asking more-critical questions and engaging in more discourse during lessons.<sup>32</sup></p>
Adoption of NCO education	<p><u>Georgia</u>: As a result of a DEEP assessment and evaluation workshop, a standard operating procedures document for NCO student evaluation has been published and is now being used in Georgia. DEEP initiatives resulted in the Georgian NCO training center's decision to develop a master instructor program to award instructors who achieve excellence and mastery of important pedagogy skills. Formal policy that incorporates this development is in the draft stage. DEEP observers also noted that Georgian partners have begun to link levels of NCO education to their career progression, which is a substantial step in the long-term development of the Georgian NCO corps.<sup>33</sup></p> <p><u>Serbia</u>: Through DEEP support, the Serbian battle staff course for midgrade NCOs has adjusted its curriculum and teaching methodology to ensure that the most up-to-date approaches for course delivery are being executed.<sup>34</sup></p> <p><u>Ukraine</u>: DEEP efforts in support of new NCO academy curricula have assisted in the institutionalization of both basic- and intermediate-level NCO courses, and 2016 DEEP engagements with the Ukrainian NCO leadership confirmed that the country's NCO training centers were moving forward with the creation of an NCO senior-level course.<sup>35</sup></p>

TABLE 2—CONTINUED

Action	Accomplishment
Support of senior partner-nation and defense education institution leadership for PfPC programs related to DEEP	<p><u>Armenia</u>: In a meeting with a NATO representative, the first deputy minister of defense said that the U.S.-NATO partnership "is now the 'go-to' source for our Joint Professional Military Education (JPME)."<sup>36</sup> He expressed his satisfaction with DEEP to NATO's Deputy Secretary General and requested continued DEEP support for reform. In 2016, he personally attended one of the DEEP faculty development workshops for the military university.<sup>37</sup></p> <p><u>Ukraine</u>: Ukrainian President Petro Poroshenko personally cited DEEP during the NATO-Ukraine council meeting at the September 2014 NATO Wales Summit. The Ukrainian foreign and defense ministers stressed the importance of DEEP during every NATO ministerial meeting.<sup>38</sup></p>
Contribution of partner-nation educators and NCO experts (military and civilian) in PfPC programs related to DEEP	<p><u>Moldova</u>: Moldova Military Academy faculty members have become active DEEP SME providers for a number of programs related to DEEP, having previously served as members for the development of the intermediate officer portion of the generic officer reference curriculum, facilitators for the multinational faculty development workshops, and participants for the original initial DEEP site survey visit to Iraq.<sup>39</sup></p> <p><u>Kazakhstan</u>: KNDU hosted five Armenian PME educators in November 2016 to potentially develop a Western operational art course for the Armenian Military Institute. This was the first time that Kazakhstan partnered with another DEEP partner nation for a specific DEEP event conducted by its faculty.<sup>40</sup></p>
Contribution to NATO and U.S. strategic goals	<p><u>Mauritania</u>: In Mauritania, DEEP efforts focused on higher-level military interoperability between NATO and Mauritania, the establishment/enhancement of partner relationships between Mauritania and contributing NATO nations, and the development of military capabilities to support regional stability and international NATO military missions, with a particular emphasis on counterterrorism and counterinsurgency.<sup>41</sup></p> <p><u>Mongolia</u>: In Mongolia, DEEP contributed to the development of military capabilities to support regional stability and international military missions (e.g., the Resolute Support Mission in Afghanistan). These efforts helped fill critical shortfalls for NATO.<sup>42</sup></p>
Contribution to meeting partner requirements and goals	<p><u>Kazakhstan</u>: DEEP has worked with the Kazakhstan Partnership and Training Education Centres to develop four courses on peacekeeping operations to prepare Kazakhstani personnel for United Nations peacekeeping operation missions. The courses were critical to prepare the Kazakhstani Armed Forces to participate in military observer peacekeeping operation missions with the United Nations in Africa and Haiti beginning in 2015.<sup>43</sup></p> <p><u>Moldova</u>: DEEP reviewers have noted that Moldova has established the desired professional education programs that the country has sought to implement. The reviewers of DEEP initiatives in Moldova highlighted the reform of Moldovan defense institutions and the enhancement of the Moldovan Armed Forces' military capabilities to contribute to Euro-Atlantic security.<sup>44</sup></p>

---

*Achieving the goals of the DEEP concept is a long process for partner nations. It has taken years to establish new institutions or courses, and, in some instances, DEEP observers have recognized that progress could require additional years of assistance.*

Azerbaijan Military College of the Armed Forces; Afghanistan National Defense University's civilian oversight of the Armed Forces and interagency coordination courses; Mongolian National Defense University staff officer course; KNDU Western operational art, logistics, and civil-military relations courses; and the basic and intermediate Ukraine NCO courses. These new courses, along with the new modern teaching methodologies adapted by the KNDU and the Uzbek Armed Forces Academy, have also contributed to the adoption of Euro-Atlantic standards and values. Such subjects as civil-military relations and interagency coordination—with their emphases on democratic decisionmaking processes—were not typically part of a PME school curriculum in non-Euro-Atlantic countries. Critical thinking skills and innovation in teaching methods were also normally associated with Western approaches to education and were not necessarily practiced in other parts of the world.

### **Lessons Learned**

Achieving the goals of the DEEP concept is a long process for partner nations. It has taken years to establish new institutions or courses, and, in some instances, DEEP observers have recognized that progress could require additional years of assistance. The advancements made by the 11 DEEP partner nations therefore vary (as described in the DEEP 2016 MOE report). Based on the report

and our experience with the program, the authors have identified five key lessons for successful DEEP projects:

- Partner nations benefit most from SMEs with backgrounds from counterpart PME schools and substantive knowledge that aligns with partner needs.
- Strong partner-nation ministerial and school leadership support promotes sustainable success.
- Successful curriculum development pays dividends.
- Faculty development promotes institutionalization of reforms.
- Sound planning draws on resources and experiences from multiple nations.

### **Partner Nations Benefit Most from Subject-Matter Experts with Backgrounds from Counterpart Professional Military Education Schools and Substantive Knowledge That Aligns with Partner Needs**

As a demand-driven program, the detailed priorities and needs of DEEP partner-nation defense education institutions are the focus of the effort. Based on these priorities and needs, a program or plan of annual events is developed to implement DEEP support for the identified partner-nation PME school. Once the annual plan is developed, proper SMEs are required to execute DEEP supporting activities.

It was understood from the beginning by the creators of DEEP that recruitment of SMEs would be key to program success. The

first DEEP coordinator worked with colleagues—all academics and current in PME curriculum and pedagogy—from the U.S. Army War College, the U.S. Naval War College, the Canadian Defense Academy, the Geneva Center for Security Policy, and the Marshall Center. Essential to this recruitment effort was the offer to pay for all travel expenses (at no cost to the parent organization), to schedule travel during nonteaching periods, and to gain exposure to the former Soviet Union. The role that the Marshall Center’s PfPC and NATO staff played in providing this administrative and managerial support has proven to be essential to the willingness of the SMEs to offer their time and expertise.

SMEs must have substantive academic expertise of the same type and level of institution to the partner school. Normally this would mean that the SME has taught the subject, has a degree in the subject, has created curriculum on the subject, or has published literature on the subject. The selection of experts from both U.S. and NATO European PME school communities that operate at the same type and level of institution as the partner school demonstrates seriousness of purpose on the part of the supporting DEEP project and has been found to create instant credibility with the respective partner-school faculty.

The SME academic country leads for each DEEP country program are members of the PfPC’s EDWG, which consist of specialists who work on faculty development teaching pedagogy, the creation of reference curricula in specific subjects, and NCO

education. To ensure that all EDWG members can mutually support all DEEP efforts, the EDWG meets annually to share their progress reports and identify best DEEP practices.

To demonstrate the significance of ensuring that the appropriate curriculum support for a given DEEP partner nation is being conveyed, the U.S. model for curriculum for a logistics course was proposed in the case of one nation’s PME school. After an initial one-week curriculum development workshop, the partner-nation school rapidly determined that the U.S. global focus and comparatively massive resources did not match the partner nation’s real-world situation, which was characterized by a regional focus, far more limited resources, and academic needs. This determination mandated a requirement for DEEP to identify a different NATO country from which to draw logistics curriculum SMEs. Once the new SMEs who could draw on their nation’s similar experience to the supported partner nation in operational and strategic-level logistics were in place, a new curriculum that adhered to NATO standards was rapidly developed and taught at the partner-nation school. The school’s leadership indicated satisfaction with the new ability to teach a subject based on the lessons learned from a country that had similar experiences with logistics modernization.<sup>45</sup>

Equally important positive experiences took place when, in the case of Moldova, after the initial DEEP assessment in 2009, representatives from the Netherlands Defense Academy, the Czech University of Defense, and the Swiss Military Academy

---

*The first DEEP coordinator worked with colleagues—all academics and current in PME curriculum and pedagogy—from the U.S. Army War College, the U.S. Naval War College, the Canadian Defense Academy, the Geneva Center for Security Policy, and the Marshall Center.*

collaborated and supported the Moldovan Military Academy (MMA) faculty's efforts to transform the basic course—developed as a four-year-course designed to commission new junior officers (similar to any NATO-nation pre-commissioning military academy).<sup>46</sup> Through this targeted, peer-to-peer collaboration, ideas and sample curricula from all these institutions were offered for incorporation into the MMA's various curricula.<sup>47</sup> The same has been true with DEEP support for the development of the KNDU civil-military relations course. When informed that the DEEP SME was Marybeth Ulrich—a member of the faculty of the U.S. Army War College and a civil-military relations scholar who has published numerous books and articles—the KNDU commandant immediately voiced satisfaction with the choice and directed his immediate subordinates to ensure maximum support for the effort.<sup>48</sup>

### **Strong Partner-Nation Ministerial and School Leadership Support Promote Sustainable Success**

Ministers of defense and PME leadership in partner nations must provide policy direction to all relevant subordinate organizations (e.g., ministerial offices, general and service staffs, supported PME schools) to ensure that there is strong support of the educational changes enacted by DEEP. It should also be made clear by partner-nation leaders to their PME systems that the identified changes are key to implementing the institutional adjustments necessary to professionalize their PME institutions and fully adopt Euro-Atlantic PME educational norms.

Inconsistent leadership can jeopardize the institutionalization of the transformations that DEEP seeks to implement and ultimately delay defense institutions from becoming self-sufficient in educating their armed forces.

---

### *Inconsistent leadership can jeopardize the institutionalization of the transformations that DEEP seeks to implement and ultimately delay defense institutions from becoming self-sufficient in educating their armed forces.*

This was the case for one DEEP partner nation: The MOD and general staff constantly disagreed over components of the curriculum changes desired for their PME school system. Once that country's DEEP leadership raised this problem to the MOD leadership, that nation's MOD was able to resolve the issue of mixed policy direction coming from the general staff, which resulted in the rapid movement on further DEEP-supported curriculum development.<sup>49</sup>

In contrast, DEEP's positive influence on the transformation of Moldova and Kazakhstan's PME institutions can be strongly tied to the support from both senior-level leadership in the MODs and PME institutions in those countries. Moldova's DEEP project initially frequently communicated with the then-minister of defense, who expressed his strong support for PME transformation.<sup>50</sup> The Moldovan MOD had also committed itself to the institutionalization of curriculum transformation by requiring that curricula comply with standards articulated by the Moldovan Ministry of Education and Moldovan education legislation.<sup>51</sup> In addition, in Kazakhstan, the chief of defense had also been personally involved in the development of the NCO curriculum at the Kazakhstan NCO Training Center through DEEP.<sup>52</sup>

## Successful Curriculum Development Pays Dividends

Typically, once a partner PME school can collaborate on initial curriculum development with DEEP SMEs and then teach it for the first time, the school then more clearly understands the value added to their programs and seeks additional curriculum development support. This kind of development can be seen in the creation or refinement of courses or individual lessons, as well as through curriculum development that results in the creation of an entire new defense education institution.

Through DEEP curriculum development support, DEEP SMEs can provide additional information and expertise—such as collaborating on the development of learning objectives, readings, in-class exercises or simulations, measurement for student learning, and audio or visual aids—to partner-nation PME institutions to facilitate further curriculum development.<sup>53</sup>

At the KNDU, after the conclusion of the development of a Western operational art course through DEEP assistance and an acknowledgment by KNDU leadership about the perceived value of the course, the KNDU requested support in subsequent years for the development of additional courses on logistics, civil-military relations, and special operations. The same was true when the Mauritanian Staff College initially requested DEEP support for a course on NATO, which later evolved to desired

curriculum development support for comprehensive courses on counterterrorism and operational planning design.<sup>54</sup>

Successful curriculum development also can provide long-term capacity for a nation through the education of personnel tasked for specific missions. The peacekeeping-focused courses created for Kazakhstan's Partnership and Training Education Centres included courses on being a United Nations staff officer, legal aspects of peace support operations, the United Nations protection of civilians and, shortly, the United Nations members on mission (military observers). These courses provided the necessary preparation for the inaugural deployment of Kazakhstani military personnel for United Nations peacekeeping operations to Africa and Haiti in 2015 and 2016.<sup>55</sup>

## Faculty Development Promotes Institutionalization of Reforms

Crucial to the success of individual DEEP partner-nation programs of cooperation is to the professional development of faculty able to teach with the most-modern teaching methodologies that stimulate student critical thinking and, more important, the long-term institutionalization of the reforms that DEEP seeks to implement.

Furthermore, in our experience with DEEP-provided knowledge of and exposure to models of Euro-Atlantic PME, partner-nation faculty almost always shift away from authoritarian, teacher-centered instructional approaches to a student-centric,

---

*Through DEEP curriculum development support, DEEP SMEs can provide additional information and expertise—such as collaborating on the development of learning objectives, readings, in-class exercises or simulations, measurement for student learning, and audio or visual aids—to partner-nation PME institutions to facilitate further curriculum development.*

collaborative learning processes that exhibit democratic values and uses critical thinking. Such skills will assist graduates in individual and innovative thinking, skills that are critical to interoperability with NATO operations.

When DEEP was initiated for Kazakhstan and Ukraine, it was clear that their PME schools either did not use or rarely used modern teaching methodologies. DEEP SME observations conducted after the completion of basic faculty development programs in the 2016–2017 time frame reported clear adaptation of modern teaching methodologies. Instructors spoke extemporaneously and did not read from books or slides, made eye contact with the students, complemented students for their verbal answers, and gently corrected them when necessary. Students were questioned on, not criticized for, their responses and were encouraged to ask questions of both the instructor and other students when presenting information. In the end, student critical thinking was an apparent partner-nation PME school objective in all cases observed by DEEP personnel during annual program reviews.<sup>56</sup>

### **Sound Planning Draws on Resources and Experiences from Multiple Nations**

DEEP found that a one-size-fits-all approach is insufficient to confront the diverse challenges a nation faces when it seeks to transform its PME institutions. In effect, the program provides the opportunity and resources for a partner-nation school to be able to identify the best defense education models to emulate. Generally, a partner nation can identify methods and processes from multiple countries that share similar historic experiences and have contemporary militaries with similar missions, sizes, and resources. The result is that DEEP has worked hard to support the concept of

multinational-resourced events with teams of SMEs representing a number of similar but somewhat different approaches to various curriculum areas of instruction. In some areas of curriculum development, it was clear that curriculum models other than those found in the U.S. military system were more applicable to the conditions related to a specific partner nation. As noted in the first lesson, a U.S. approach does not always translate well to a partner nation. In the end, the partner nation made the decision on the curriculum approaches it wanted to adapt.

Nearly every DEEP partner nation has received multinational support. In Azerbaijan, construction of an initial framework and lesson requirements for a senior operational and strategic course relied on DEEP-sponsored visits to Bulgarian, Czech, and Swedish defense institutions.<sup>57</sup> The course that was ultimately developed was designed to include curricula found in similar Bulgarian, Czech, and Swedish courses.<sup>58</sup> The same was true in Afghanistan, where peer-to-peer institutional relationships with defense education institutions in Poland and Bulgaria have contributed to leadership development, improved teaching methods, and the modernization of curricula at the Command and Staff College of the Afghan Military's Marshal Fahim National Defense University.<sup>59</sup>

### **Conclusion**

This analysis demonstrated that DEEP was able to influence potential professional military education change and the adoption of Euro-Atlantic standards and values. The creation of a variety of new courses and separate curricula, along with modern teaching methodologies, influenced the adoption of significant Euro-Atlantic standards and values related to democratization decisionmaking processes and individual concepts of critical thinking and innovation.

While all participating DEEP partner nations have made progress in aligning their defense education institutions closer to Euro-Atlantic PME standards and values, sustained transformation and success will continue to require strong commitment from partner-nation ministerial and PME leaders. This commitment can be made through allocating the appropriate resources toward the continual modernization of curriculum and faculty development as well as political and organizational support. DEEP is an influential and low-cost security cooperation tool in promoting partnerships outside of the traditional Euro-Atlantic community. Because DEEP SMEs voluntarily provide their expertise, the costs of engaging them are modest (just travel and per diem allowances). In addition, the peer-to-peer element of DEEP exchanges promote continued collaboration and mentorship between DEEP experts and partner-nation counterparts as participating partner nations determine the best way forward for their PME systems.

DEEP also advances DoD's objectives by incorporating key U.S. DIB priorities, which ensures that the professionalization of military education systems is a principal focus for each DEEP country program. Such priorities reflect DoD's continued support for defense education security cooperation efforts within a larger DIB context. Through its focus on talent and human capital,

---

*DEEP also advances DoD's objectives by incorporating key U.S. DIB priorities, which ensures that the professionalization of military education systems is a principal focus for each DEEP country program.*

DEEP leaves an intellectual and enduring footprint in the defense education institutions it supports.

Within the Euro-Atlantic community, defense education has always played the role of preparing military and civilian government personnel to be able to undertake positions that required the fulfillment of DIB responsibilities. For example, this education includes training students on conducting strategy, planning, and policy at the staff and war-college levels of the PME. If this education support provided by DEEP or a similar program did not take place, then every time personnel or senior-level staff transferred out of a ministry that was responsible for some form of DIB, new education or training would have to be conducted for those personnel elements. With no consistency, partner-nations would have to start over repeatedly to execute the given DIB-related mission. In short, defense education is the avenue for developing and nurturing key professional competencies within the defense and security sectors.<sup>60</sup>

By ensuring that successive generations of defense and security personnel are equipped with the required skills and knowledge, DEEP partner nations have been enabled to develop their own capacities and resilience to train and educate their armed forces. The lessons learned from ongoing DEEP projects, as shown in the cases of Moldova and Kazakhstan, demonstrate how countries can move closer to orchestrating their own PME systems without any external assistance. Over time, these education efforts will equip partner nations with a real capacity to sustain other DIB changes. As more DEEP partner nations move toward the overall professionalization of their armed forces and transformation of their PME systems, the long-term potential to further Euro-Atlantic interests related to security and stability becomes more feasible.

## Notes

<sup>1</sup> Fred Tanner, “Deficiencies in Global Governance and Implications for Defense Education,” *Connections*, Vol. 11, No. 4, Fall 2012, pp. 1–10.

<sup>2</sup> James M. Keagle, “A Special Relationship: U.S. and NATO Engagement with the Partnership for Peace to Build Partner Capacity Through Education,” *Connections*, Vol. 11, No. 4, Fall 2012, pp. 59–74.

<sup>3</sup> NATO, “Partners,” November 11, 2015. As of November 17, 2017: <https://www.nato.int/cps/ic/natohq/51288.htm>

<sup>4</sup> NATO’s Mediterranean Dialogue was inaugurated in 1994 by the North Atlantic Council. It currently involves seven non-NATO countries of the Mediterranean region: Algeria, Egypt, Israel, Jordan, Mauritania, Morocco, and Tunisia. See NATO, “Mediterranean Dialogue,” last updated January 31, 2018. As of June 8, 2018: [http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natolive/topics\\_52927.htm](http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natolive/topics_52927.htm)

<sup>5</sup> To reinforce the efforts of NATO Training Mission–Iraq, NATO and the Iraqi government established a structured cooperation framework to develop the alliance’s long-term partnership with Iraq. NATO, “NATO’s Assistance to Iraq (Archived),” September 1, 2015. As of August 21, 2017: [http://www.nato.int/cps/is/natohq/topics\\_51978.htm](http://www.nato.int/cps/is/natohq/topics_51978.htm)

<sup>6</sup> In 2010, NATO and Afghanistan signed a Declaration on Enduring Partnership for NATO to provide long-term political and practical support to Afghanistan’s security institutions. NATO, “Afghanistan and NATO’s Enduring Partnership,” media backgrounder, April 2011. As of June 11, 2018: [https://www.nato.int/nato\\_static/assets/pdf/pdf\\_2011\\_04/20110414\\_110414-AfghanPartnership.pdf](https://www.nato.int/nato_static/assets/pdf/pdf_2011_04/20110414_110414-AfghanPartnership.pdf)

<sup>7</sup> John Berry, “Defense Education Enhancement Program: The Consortium Perspective,” *Connections*, Vol. 11, No. 4, Fall 2012, pp. 27–33.

<sup>8</sup> Berry, 2012, p. 31.

<sup>9</sup> Berry, 2012, p. 31.

<sup>10</sup> Defense Security Cooperation Agency, “Wales Initiative Funds,” webpage, undated. As of June 11, 2018: <http://www.dsca.mil/programs/wales-initiative-funds>

<sup>11</sup> Berry, 2012, p. 30.

<sup>12</sup> NATO, “NATO 2020: Assured Security; Dynamic Engagement: Analysis and Recommendations of the Group of Experts on a New Strategic Concept for NATO,” NATO webpage, May 17, 2010. As of August 21, 2017: [http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natolive/official\\_texts\\_63654.htm](http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natolive/official_texts_63654.htm)

<sup>13</sup> NATO, “Istanbul Summit Communiqué,” NATO webpage, June 28, 2004. As of August 21, 2017: <http://www.nato.int/docu/pr/2004/p04-096e.htm>

<sup>14</sup> Jean d’Andurain and Alan G. Stolberg, “Defense Education Enhancement Program: The NATO Functional Clearing-House on Defense,” *Connections*, Vol. 11, No. 4, Fall 2012, pp. 53–58.

<sup>15</sup> d’Andurain and Stolberg, 2012, p. 54.

<sup>16</sup> The White House, *National Security Strategy*, Washington, D.C., February 2015, p. 2. As of August 21, 2017: [http://www.g8.army.mil/pdf/National\\_Security\\_Strategy\\_6Feb2015.pdf](http://www.g8.army.mil/pdf/National_Security_Strategy_6Feb2015.pdf) and the White House, *National Security Strategy*, Washington, D.C., May 2010, p. 7. As of August 21, 2017: <http://nssarchive.us/NSSR/2010.pdf>

<sup>17</sup> U.S. Department of Defense, *Sustaining U.S. Global Leadership: Priorities for 21st Century Defense*, Washington, D.C., January 2012, p. 3. As of August 21, 2017: [http://www.defense.gov/news/defense\\_strategic\\_guidance.pdf](http://www.defense.gov/news/defense_strategic_guidance.pdf)

<sup>18</sup> Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, *The National Military Strategy of the United States of America 2015: The United States Military’s Contribution to National Security*, June 2015, p. 5. As of August 21, 2017: [http://www.jcs.mil/Portals/36/Documents/Publications/2015\\_National\\_Military\\_Strategy.pdf](http://www.jcs.mil/Portals/36/Documents/Publications/2015_National_Military_Strategy.pdf)

<sup>19</sup> Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, 2015.

<sup>20</sup> PfPC Education Development Working Group, “Measures of Effectiveness (MOE) for the Defense Education Enhancement Program (DEEP),” December 31, 2016, p. 1.

<sup>21</sup> PfPC Education Development Working Group, 2016, p. 1.

<sup>22</sup> PfPC Education Development Working Group, 2016, pp. 2–3.

<sup>23</sup> “The Bologna Process is an intergovernmental cooperation of 48 European countries in the field of higher education. It guides the collective effort of public authorities, universities, teachers, and students, together with stakeholder associations, employers, quality assurance agencies, international organisations, and institutions, including the European Commission, on how to improve the internationalisation of higher education.” See European Commission, “The Bologna Process and the European Higher Education Area,” webpage, undated. As of June 15, 2018: [https://ec.europa.eu/education/policy/higher-education/bologna-process\\_en](https://ec.europa.eu/education/policy/higher-education/bologna-process_en)

- <sup>24</sup> PfPC Education Development Working Group, 2016, p. 1.
- <sup>25</sup> See, generally, PfPC, “Strategic Plans for DEEP Armenia for 2017,” December 31, 2016b; PfPC, “Strategic Plan for DEEP Georgia for 2017,” December 31, 2016c; PfPC, “Strategic Plan for DEEP Kazakhstan for 2017,” December 31, 2016d.
- <sup>26</sup> PfPC Education Development Working Group, 2016, p. 5.
- <sup>27</sup> PfPC Education Development Working Group, 2016, p. 7.
- <sup>28</sup> PfPC Education Development Working Group, 2016, p. 4.
- <sup>29</sup> PfPC Education Development Working Group, 2016, p. 24.
- <sup>30</sup> PfPC Education Development Working Group, 2016, p. 15.
- <sup>31</sup> PfPC Education Development Working Group, 2016, p. 15.
- <sup>32</sup> PfPC Education Development Working Group, 2016, p. 34.
- <sup>33</sup> PfPC Education Development Working Group, 2016, p. 12.
- <sup>34</sup> PfPC Education Development Working Group, 2016, p. 25.
- <sup>35</sup> PfPC Education Development Working Group, 2016, p. 30.
- <sup>36</sup> PfPC Education Development Working Group, 2016, p. 7.
- <sup>37</sup> PfPC Education Development Working Group, 2016, p. 6.
- <sup>38</sup> PfPC Education Development Working Group, 2016, p. 30.
- <sup>39</sup> PfPC Education Development Working Group, 2016, p. 22.
- <sup>40</sup> PfPC Education Development Working Group, 2016, p. 16.
- <sup>41</sup> PfPC Education Development Working Group, 2016, p. 18.
- <sup>42</sup> PfPC Education Development Working Group, 2016, p. 25.
- <sup>43</sup> PfPC Education Development Working Group, 2016, p. 16.
- <sup>44</sup> PfPC Education Development Working Group, 2016, p. 23.
- <sup>45</sup> Alan G. Stolberg, “Defense Education Enhancement Program (DEEP) Personal Observations,” August 2013–October 2017.
- <sup>46</sup> John F. Troxell, “The Moldovan Military Academy: Transforming Education,” *Connections*, Vol. 11, No. 4, Fall 2012, p. 104.
- <sup>47</sup> Troxell, 2012, p. 104.
- <sup>48</sup> Azakh Ryspayev, major-general commandant of the Kazakh National Defense University, interview with Alan Stolberg, Astana, Kazakhstan, February 2015.
- <sup>49</sup> Stolberg, 2013–2017.
- <sup>50</sup> PfPC document about Moldova, not available to the public.
- <sup>51</sup> PfPC document about Moldova, not available to the public.
- <sup>52</sup> PfPC Education Development Working Group, 2016, p. 15.
- <sup>53</sup> Alan G. Stolberg, “Defense Education Enhancement Program: The Kazakhstan Experience,” *Connections*, Vol. 11, No. 4, Fall 2012, p. 112.
- <sup>54</sup> Alan G. Stolberg, unpublished notes, July 6, 2017.
- <sup>55</sup> PfPC, “Strategic Plans for DEEP Afghanistan for 2017,” December 31, 2016a, p. 5.
- <sup>56</sup> Alan G. Stolberg, “Report: 20–23 June 2016 Annual Review Visit for the Kazakhstan DEEP,” unpublished paper, June 2016, pp. 4–5; NATO International Staff and the Partnership for Peace Consortium, “DEEP Ukraine 2016 Programme Review: 11–15 December 2016,” unpublished paper, December 2016.
- <sup>57</sup> PfPC Education Development Working Group, 2016, p. 8.
- <sup>58</sup> PfPC Education Development Working Group, 2016, p. 7.
- <sup>59</sup> PfPC, 2016a.
- <sup>60</sup> NATO International Staff, “Think Piece: Defense Education as a Component of Defense Institution Building (DIB): What Is the Role of the Defense Education Enhancement Program (DEEP),” unpublished paper, 2017.

## About the Authors

**Alan G. Stolberg** is a policy analyst at the RAND Corporation and retired Army colonel who spent 15 years on the faculties of both the U.S. Army and Naval War Colleges. Before assuming his current position as coordinator for DEEP in 2013, Stolberg had been an associate professor of National Security Studies, director of the National Security Policy Program, and holder of the Henry L. Stimson Chair of Military Studies at the U.S. Army War College. He has been associated with DEEP since its inception in 2007, when he led the initial site survey to the National Defense University of Kazakhstan. In his current capacity as the DEEP coordinator, he has traveled to almost every DEEP country while serving as the senior mentor for the initial site survey scoping teams and has personally conducted program reviews of several countries.

**Stuart E. Johnson** is a senior policy analyst at the RAND Corporation. He has served in a variety of posts in the defense field with a focus on defense planning and programming and on European security affairs. Johnson currently leads RAND research that focuses on European defense issues and the future of U.S. and allied military cooperation, including DEEP. He is also professor at the Pardee RAND Graduate School and has held adjunct professor roles at Columbia University's School of International and Public Affairs.

**Laura Kupe** is a policy analyst at the RAND Corporation. A lawyer by training, she most recently worked at the U.S. Department of Homeland Security as a special assistant, a role in which she served as a subject-matter expert in the department's engagement with European Union member states and the Five Eyes on security cooperation topics, including migration, border security, and counterterrorism.

## About This Perspective

This Perspective reviews influences on partner nations and accomplishments in the Defense Education Enhancement Program (DEEP) to record the lessons that the authors have learned from working in this program.

The work reviewed in this perspective was conducted in the RAND National Defense Research Institute (NDRI) by the International Security and Defense Policy Center (ISDP) and by the Forces and Resources Center (FRP). NDRI is a federally funded research and development center sponsored by the Office of the Secretary of Defense, the Joint Staff, the Unified Combatant Commands, the Navy, the Marine Corps, the defense agencies, and the defense Intelligence Community.

## Acknowledgments

The authors would like to thank Charles Goldman for his thoughtful review and suggestions which have added to the rigor and clarity of this perspective. We would also like to thank Jerry Sollinger for a careful edit of the draft of this manuscript.

## Limited Print and Electronic Distribution Rights

This document and trademark(s) contained herein are protected by law. This representation of RAND intellectual property is provided for noncommercial use only. Unauthorized posting of this publication online is prohibited. Permission is given to duplicate this document for personal use only, as long as it is unaltered and complete. Permission is required from RAND to reproduce, or reuse in another form, any of our research documents for commercial use. For information on reprint and linking permissions, please visit [www.rand.org/pubs/permissions.html](http://www.rand.org/pubs/permissions.html).

The RAND Corporation is a research organization that develops solutions to public policy challenges to help make communities throughout the world safer and more secure, healthier and more prosperous. RAND is nonprofit, nonpartisan, and committed to the public interest.

RAND's publications do not necessarily reflect the opinions of its research clients and sponsors. **RAND**<sup>®</sup> is a registered trademark.

For more information on this publication, visit [www.rand.org/1/PE286](http://www.rand.org/1/PE286).



[www.rand.org](http://www.rand.org)