Research Article

The Evolution of DEEP Faculty Development under the Partnership for Peace Consortium

John Hagen and Iryna Lysychkina (iD)

DEEP Faculty Development Group, Education Development Working Group, Partnership for Peace Consortium, https://www.pfp-consortium.org/

Abstract: For nearly two decades, the Partnership for Peace Consortium and the North Atlantic Treaty Organization have led efforts to modernize Professional Military Education instruction in NATO partner countries through the Defense Education Enhancement Program (DEEP). In this article, the authors examine the evolution of these faculty development initiatives by focusing on three key factors: program structure and content, the expertise of the training teams, and the expectations of participating institutions. Using Phillips and Ochs' educational transfer model as an analytical framework, the article traces how these factors have influenced the adoption of student-centered learning approaches across the model's four stages. The analysis reveals a progression from post-Soviet states seeking fundamental military education reforms to a more diverse group of partner nations with established institutions looking for modern teaching approaches. The development of structured programs, such as the Foundational Faculty Development Program and the Master Instructor Program, reflects an evolution toward more systematic and sustainable faculty development efforts. The authors emphasize the need for continuous program adaptation, clear institutional expectations, and diverse recruitment to sustain DEEP's relevance in modernizing professional military education.

Keywords: professional military education, PME, PfP Consortium, Defense Education Enhancement Program, DEEP, faculty development, educational transfer, student-centered learning, pedagogical modernization, community of practice.

Partnership for Peace Consortium of Defense
Academies and Security Studies Institutes

Creative Commons
BY-SA 4.0

Introduction

Since 1999, the Partnership for Peace Consortium (PfPC), in collaboration with the NATO International Staff, has led an ambitious effort to modernize Professional Military Education (PME) instruction in states partnering with the Consortium or NATO.[1] The Consortium began as a NATO-endorsed partnership, initiated by the United States and Germany, later joined by Switzerland and Austria, and now includes nine stakeholder states, along with NATO.[2] The PfPC is organized around multiple working and study groups focusing on defense institution building and security research, aiming to strengthen defense and military education through enhanced national and institutional cooperation. The Education Development Working Group (EDWG) maintains a group of subject matter experts focused on PME faculty development. The EDWG's faculty development group conducts workshops as part of the Defense Education Enhancement Program (DEEP), a program jointly managed by the PfPC and NATO International Staff. Within DEEP, the faculty development group has conducted workshops in 19 countries and over 40 military institutions, introducing andragogic and student-centered approaches for instruction that encourage critical thinking and promote active learning among military students while advancing democratic values and fostering consideration of diverse perspectives.

Given this multi-decade effort, it is important to reflect on how partner-state PME institutions have received these new instructional approaches, how the faculty development needs of these institutions have evolved, and what these changes mean for future PfPC programs. Three key factors influence how institutions engage with PfPC faculty development programs. The primary factor is the program itself – its structure, characteristics, content, and desired outcomes. Change in a defense institution's educational approach requires a shift in its organizational culture, and to paraphrase Peter Drucker, "culture eats pedagogy

---

[1] Currently there are 15 DEEP partner nations: Armenia, Azerbaijan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Colombia, Georgia, Iraq, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Mauritania, Moldova, Mongolia, Morocco, Serbia, Tunisia, and Ukraine. PfPC also partners with the Uzbekistan Armed Forces Academy. For more information on NATO partner countries, refer to "Defence Education Enhancement Program (DEEP)," *What We Do*, NATO, September 24, 2024, https://www.nato.int/cps/en/natohq/topics_139182.htm.

[2] As of November 2024, stakeholders in the PfPC include Austria, Bulgaria, Canada, Germany, NATO, Poland, Romania, Sweden, Switzerland, and the United States. For early histories of the PfPC and the role of the NATO International Staff, see John Berry, "Defense Education Enhancement Program: The Consortium Perspective," *Connections: The Quarterly Journal* 11, no. 4 (2012): 27-33, https://doi.org/10.11610/Connections.11.4.03; and Jean d'Andurain and Alan G. Stolberg, "Defense Education Enhancement Program: The NATO Functional Clearing-House on Defense Education," *Connections: The Quarterly Journal* 11, no. 4 (2012): 53-58, https://doi.org/10.11610/Connections.11.4.06.

for breakfast." [3] Consequently, faculty development programs must be designed to allow instructors and institutions first to absorb new concepts, critically examine and test those concepts, and then arrive at their own conclusions about their applicability. For PfPC faculty development programs, the most notable change has been the development of workshops that are more structured and purposefully designed to achieve specific outcomes.

Secondly, the specific expertise and individual capabilities of the faculty development group's members are critical. Each member must be both a practitioner and a scholar of faculty development. This expertise goes beyond being a good instructor in one's classroom. It requires understanding how adults learn and the implications for instruction in professional military education. For partner states, the continued relevance and legitimacy of the group depend on its members continuously exploring and testing new ideas in the field of military education.

Team effectiveness extends beyond familiarity with a workshop's content. During workshops, members must model the approaches and methods they are presenting. Moreover, since no two workshop conditions are identical, teams must be adaptable in real time to varying situations. Whether facing room arrangement issues, jet lag, language barriers, diverse participant motivations, electrical power and connectivity issues, or even lost luggage containing all the training supplies, training teams must remain creative and professional to ensure workshop success. Success often depends on the soft skills of the team to quickly adapt to the environment, establish rapport with participants, and deliver presentations in a style that is engaging and appropriate for the audience.

The final factor to consider is the expectations of PME institutions. Lasting organizational change results from both bottom-up and top-down initiatives. In this context, program recipients are not just the classroom instructors receiving content in a workshop but also institutional leaders, such as deans of faculty or school commandants, for whom student-centered approaches may challenge traditional views of military education. Over the past two decades, the motivations, prior understanding, and technical capabilities of these instructors and their leadership have evolved. As a result, their current expectations from faculty development programs may differ significantly from those of their predecessors.

To understand how changes in these three factors have impacted the acceptance of new instructional ideas, this article applies an educational transfer model developed by Phillips and Ochs.[4] In their model, Phillips and Ochs describe a four-stage process by which educational policy is borrowed from one state to

---

[3] Carolyn Whitzman, "'Culture Eats Strategy for Breakfast': The Powers and Limitations of Urban Design Education," *Journal of Urban Design* 21 (2016): 574-576, https://doi.org/10.1080/13574809.2016.1220157.

[4] David Phillips and Kimberly Ochs, "Processes of Policy Borrowing in Education: Some Analytical and Explanatory Devices," *Comparative Education* 39, no. 4 (2003): 451-461, https://doi.org/10.1080/0305006032000162020.

be used in another. While this model was originally designed to analyze educational transfer at the state level, it is also applicable for examining the transfer of PfPC pedagogic approaches and values to individual military institutions.

The four stages of the model are:

● Cross-national attraction

● Decision

● Implementation

● Internalization/ Indigenization.

In the cross-national attraction stage, the borrowing institution (e.g., the partner-state's PME institution) becomes aware of the inadequacies of its existing system and the appeal of an alternative system. This is followed by the decision stage, in which leaders determine how they intend to change their institution using the new approaches. This change can range from a desire for pragmatic adjustments in pedagogic approaches to superficial changes driven by more symbolic motives. In the third stage—implementation—the borrowing institution begins incorporating the new approaches into its existing system. During this phase, the degree of acceptance or resistance to the changes depends on several contextual factors and is directly related to the receptivity of new ideas. Finally, in the internalization/ indigenization stage, the borrowed policies become embedded within the host institution's program.

Phillips and Ochs' four-stage educational transfer model is cyclical. The transfer takes time, and multiple iterations are required as the interests, perspectives, and motivations of both the lending and borrowing institutions evolve. This cyclical nature is particularly relevant for examining the DEEP faculty development program, which, in some states, has been ongoing for almost twenty years and, therefore, has been subject to changes in educational approaches, institutional leadership, and even geopolitics.

This article examines the changes in the three factors affecting the PfPC effort and considers their effects within the four stages of the Phillips and Ochs' model. It concludes by analyzing the implications for further progress in PfPC faculty development programs as they enter their next two decades.

PfPC's Faculty Development Programs

Although the PfPC was initiated in 1999, it was not until NATO's Istanbul Summit in June 2004 that the Partnership Action Plan on Defense Institution Building (PAP-DIB) was launched. This plan provided guiding principles and resources to support partner countries in reforming and restructuring their military institutions.[5] From PAP-DIB emerged the concept of individual partner country Defense Education Enhancement Programs (DEEPs).[6] These programs focused on three

---

5   "Istanbul Summit Readers Guide," NATO, 2004, accessed October 30, 2024, https://www.nato.int/docu/rdr-gde-ist/rdr-gde-ist-e.pdf.

6   Berry, "Defense Education Enhancement Program: The Consortium Perspective."

key themes: what to teach, how to teach and learn, and faculty development. A reference curriculum design group addressed the first theme, "what to teach." Meanwhile, the themes of pedagogy ("how to teach and learn") and faculty development through peer-to-peer mentorship became the responsibility of the faculty development team, as discussed in this article.

Two distinct faculty development approaches arose from the PAP-DIB: an annual multinational educators' program and country-specific workshops. The multinational programs were three-day events targeting the leadership of academic institutions in partner countries. Each year, these programs focused on a specific theme and were designed for approximately 30 participants from various countries, fostering the exchange of best practices in student-centered learning.[7] The expectation was that participants would form a community of practice to share ideas and approaches, subsequently implementing these new practices within their institutions upon return.

In terms of educational transfer, these multinational programs had the potential to influence cross-national interest in PME reform and guide institutional leadership in deciding whether and how to adopt such reforms. However, as annual events with limited participation, these programs lacked direct mechanisms to ensure the implementation or integration of new educational concepts within participating institutions.

The first two multinational educators' programs were conducted at the NATO Defense College in Rome, with subsequent events hosted by different partner countries (Table 1). While the programs engaged over 200 participants, the formation of an enduring community of practice was hampered by the lack of control over the selection of attendees. Partner countries were expected to send representatives who were actively engaged in leading and developing their defense institutions. However, the PfPC had no means to enforce participant selection criteria, and attendees frequently had limited connections to their defense institutions or the ability to apply the knowledge gained upon returning.

Although the program format led to the development of multiple professional connections between participants and facilitators, it was not possible to assess the programs' impact on PME evolution in partner countries. After the 2015 event in Zagreb, Croatia, PfPC discontinued funding for the multinational programs. The Faculty Development Group then shifted its focus exclusively to the individual country DEEPs.

The other PAP-DIB-related faculty development program was the individual country DEEP, which became part of each partner country's NATO Individual Partnership Action Plan (IPAP). These individual DEEP faculty development workshops were conducted at the participating institutions and focused on military

---

7   Kathaleen Reid-Martinez, "Overcoming the Challenge of Legacy Learning Methods," *Connections: The Quarterly Journal* 11, no. 4 (2012): 43-51, https://doi.org/10.11610/Connections.11.4.05.

Table 1. Multinational Educators Programs.

Year	Program and Location
2007	Multinational Defence Educators Program, NATO Defense College, Rome, Italy
2008	2nd Annual Multinational Defence Educators Program, NATO Defense College, Rome, Italy
2009	3rd Annual Multinational Defence Educators Program "Thinking About Contemporary Ways of Teaching and Learning," Tirana, Albania
2010	4th Annual Multinational Defence Educators Program, University of Ljubljana, Slovenia
2011	5th Annual Educators Program "Learning Methodologies," Chisinau, Moldova
2012	6th Annual Multinational Educators Program "New Students, New Methods, New Assessments," Yerevan, Armenia
2013	7th Annual Multinational Educators Program "New Students, New Methods, New Assessments," Lviv, Ukraine
2014	8th Annual Defense Educators Program "Curriculum Design for New Teaching Methods," Belgrade, Serbia

instructors. A visiting team of subject matter experts organized multi-day workshops for up to 30 instructors, providing techniques and instructional approaches that supported student-centered learning and the values of the PAP-DIB. The expectation was that the DEEP team would engage with the instructors through a series of workshops coordinated via the country's IPAP. Additionally, national one-day workshops of this kind were held for the faculty of hosting institutions after each multinational program.

A pilot DEEP was launched in Kazakhstan in 2008, with content based on the self-identified interests and needs of the Kazakh National Defense University. Following its success in Kazakhstan, individual DEEP faculty development programs were initiated in Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, and Moldova.[8] These early programs primarily targeted former Soviet republics and Eastern European states seeking alternative pedagogical approaches to replace the Soviet model under which they had been operating. In some cases, such as Armenia and Kazakhstan, faculty development programs were part of an even larger effort to help these states develop their higher-level PME systems. However, as DEEP expanded into NATO's Mediterranean Dialogue countries and NATO partner coun-

---

[8] Berry, "Defense Education Enhancement Program: The Consortium Perspective," p. 30.

tries in South America and Asia, the faculty development programs began serving states with existing institutions not rooted in the Soviet model. The full list of countries receiving faculty development under the PfPC and NATO DEEP is provided in Table 2.

Table 2. Countries in Faculty Development Initiatives under PfPC and NATO DEEP.

Afghanistan	Colombia	Mauritania	Serbia
Albania	Croatia	Moldova	Tunisia
Armenia	Georgia	Mongolia	Ukraine
Azerbaijan	Iraq	Morocco	Uzbekistan
Bosnia and Herzegovina	Kazakhstan	North Macedonia	

Source: DEEP.[9]

The faculty development workshops were consistently grounded in student-centered pedagogy and methodology. Initially, the workshop team determined the specific content following a site survey visit to identify the needs and interests of the institution. As the DEEP program matured, the workshops became more structured and standardized across country DEEPs. While the workshop teams were still expected to tailor their content to the unique needs of each institution, a more formal program outline was introduced under the title *Foundational Faculty Development Program* (FFDP).

Although earlier workshops were structured around student-centered learning concepts, the FFDP explicitly adopted constructivism[10] and connectivism,[11] emphasizing the importance of interaction and collaboration among FFDP participants. During the workshops, participants were encouraged to reflect on new teaching concepts in the context of their own experiences and to discuss the implications for their classroom practices. The DEEP team also promoted the use of smartphones during workshops to bring new information and perspectives into the discussions. Additionally, as the faculty development group advanced its concept of *Communities of Practice* (CoPs), it drew on the methodological framework developed by Etienne and Beverly Wenger-Trayner.[12]

---

[9] "Defence Education Enhancement Program (DEEP)."

[10] Vincent Pouliot, "The Essence of Constructivism," *Journal of International Relations and Development* 7 (2004): 319–336, https://doi.org/10.1057/palgrave.jird.1800022.

[11] George Siemens, "Connectivism: A Learning Theory for the Digital Age," *International Journal of Instructional Technology and Distance Learning* 2, no. 1 (2005), http://www.itdl.org/Journal/Jan_05/article01.htm.

[12] Etienne Wenger-Trayner and Beverly Wenger-Trayner, "An Introduction to Communities of Practice: A Brief Overview of the Concept and Its Uses," 2015, accessed October 30, 2024, www.wenger-trayner.com/introduction-to-communities-of-practice.

All FFDPs are expected to achieve the learning outcomes listed in Table 3. To meet these outcomes, the program is now divided into three five-day workshops. The first workshop focuses on student-centered active learning methods, the second covers assessment and active learning, and in the final workshop, participants develop lesson plans and materials while exploring the integration of new technologies in their lessons.

Table 3. Foundational Faculty Development Program Learning Outcomes.

Identify best practices in student-centered learning, assessment, and instructional design in defense education.
Select and implement best practices in student-centered learning, assessment, and instructional design within the specific institutional context.
Assess progress and challenges in implementing student-centered active learning approaches.

The FFDP program was designed to be executed on-site, in the classrooms of the participating institution, by a visiting DEEP team. This arrangement allowed for the optimal interaction between participants and facilitators. Participating instructors could experiment with new methods in the same classrooms where they normally taught while the DEEP team gained a better understanding of the environmental context in which the participating instructors operated. This understanding enabled the team to tailor presentations to ensure their relevance.

However, external factors necessitated adjustments to the program's workshop presentations. Security situations in various countries, the COVID-19 pandemic, and sometimes logistical challenges prompted alternative arrangements that could leverage newly developed online learning tools. As a result, the FFDP program has also been delivered online through commercial video teleconferencing technologies. In the case of Afghanistan, the participating instructors from the National Defense University traveled to Romania or Azerbaijan to meet with the DEEP team and participate in the instruction. Recognizing that the program's global reach demands flexible approaches, the faculty development group continues to explore innovative venues and tools for delivering the program.

The FFDP provided a bottom-up approach to defense institution building focused on the implementation stage of educational transfer and improving the individual instructor. However, with the end of the multinational programs, there was no top-down mechanism to facilitate cross-national attraction or leadership decision-making regarding institutional change. As a result, while individual instructors might have been implementing best practices learned through the FFDP, there was no institutional impetus to disseminate or enhance these practices among other faculty members.

This particular need for institutionalizing the continued progress in faculty development led to the creation of the *Master Instructor Program* (MIP). Like the FFDP, the MIP was designed as a set of sequential workshops conducted at the host institutions. While the FFDP focused on developing individual classroom instructors, the MIP aimed to develop a cohort of master instructors capable of designing and executing their institution's faculty development program or course. The MIP moved beyond the implementation stage of educational transfer to provide a means for integrating these new concepts into the institution's practices. Additionally, by actively engaging institutional leadership, the MIP also fosters continued leadership involvement in decision-making.

The current MIP program outcomes are outlined in Table 4.

Table 4. Master Instructor Program Learning Outcomes.

Design and execute a faculty development course for their institution's instructors that is framed by theory and models relevant to adult learners and aligned with the needs of the institution.
Apply and advise the faculty on the content and resources on adult learning, student-centered learning, active learning, assessment and evaluation, course and lesson planning, curriculum development, and blended learning (as required).
Advise the leadership on best practices in student-centered learning and advocate for the sustainability of the faculty development program.

The structure of the MIP program aligns with the ADDIE (Analyze, Design, Develop, Implement, Evaluate) curriculum design model. The DEEP team collaborates with a select group of faculty members to analyze institutional needs and assess the applicability of DEEP faculty development concepts across the four phases of the MIP. Based on this analysis, MIP participants design a faculty development course that best serves their institution's instructors and can be sustained, given the operational tempo of the school. MIP participants are expected to conduct their research and design the corresponding modules as part of their design work. They then demonstrate a test run of the course for the DEEP team and the institution's leadership, as applicable. The program is subsequently implemented and evaluated.

In addition to designing a faculty development course, MIP participants also develop their own processes for identifying and training future master instructors who can continue updating and implementing the MIP within their institution.

Since the publication of the Faculty Development Curriculum Guide[13] in 2023, the Faculty Development Group has established criteria for the successful completion of MIP. These criteria include but are not limited to the individual performance of each master instructor and their teaching competencies, which align with defined criteria for outcomes-based military education.[14]

The Master Instructor Program began in 2017 in Ukraine, and since then, every institution has requested the MIP following the completion of FFDP, the only exception being the Collège de Défense du G5 Sahel in Nouakchott, Mauritania, where the frequent rotation of faculty and the long-term expectations for master instructors made the MIP impractical. As of the writing of this article, the Faculty Development Group of the PfPC EDWG has trained and certified 74 master instructors at 12 institutions in five countries.

While participants in both the FFDP and MIP have found the experiences worthwhile, after several iterations of both programs, it became apparent that continued engagement and institutional development often diminish after the MIP is completed. Like all military instructors, MIP graduates are busy people with multiple competing demands on their time. Without both intrinsic and extrinsic motivations for continued effort, institutional faculty development and MIP programs risk lapsing and falling into disuse. To address this need for motivation, the Faculty Development Group is implementing a sustainability program. While it is expected that institutions will run their own programs, there is also recognition that collaboration within and between institutions, as well as with the Faculty Development Group, fosters the attractiveness of new ideas and methods.

The Sustainability Program is being developed to include an annual visit to observe and support individual master instructors and institutional efforts. For the individual master instructor, this involves actions such as updating professional development plans, connecting to relevant conferences and online courses, or serving as a facilitator for a DEEP faculty development event at another institution or country. The goal is to further develop the professional identity of the master instructor.

At the institutional level, the Sustainability Program focuses on leadership engagement with the institution's faculty development program and its continued development and implementation. While the Sustainability Program is not an assessment tool, DEEP teams will use their visits to review existing faculty development courses, provide perspectives, and share new ideas. They will also meet with institutional leadership to understand their interests and needs.

Reflecting the cyclical nature of educational transfer, leadership at an institution inevitably changes, and a Commandant or Dean who initially committed to

---

13 *Faculty Development Curriculum Guide*, NATO and PfP Consortium, last updated June 7, 2023, https://www.nato.int/cps/en/natohq/topics_213129.htm.

14 Megan J. Hennessey, "Identifying, Developing, and Assessing Instructor Competencies in Outcomes-based Military Education," *New Directions for Teaching and Learning* 173 (2023): 23-32, https://doi.org/10.1002/tl.20531.

the MIP may be replaced by someone unfamiliar with the program. The Sustainability Program provides a means to ensure that faculty development efforts are not lost due to personnel turnover.

A major component of the Sustainability Program is the multi-level community of practice (CoP). Within this community, each master instructor is part of a larger network with the shared purpose of enhancing PME. This is more than a working group; a CoP involves mutual support in exploring and testing new ideas and approaches. The multi-level structure connects master instructors at the institutional, state, regional, and international levels.

At the institutional level, the master instructors form a CoP focused on their specific courses and the students within an institution. Peer observations, faculty seminars, and guest speakers are events that help this community identify and test new methods. As part of the broader national community, best practices and shared research can help advance the larger PME program. Country-wide communities of practice have already been initiated in Iraq and Ukraine. For other countries where several institutions are completing the MIP, such as Tunisia, the conditions are ideal for creating a nationally oriented community.

Finally, at the international level, the DEEP faculty development group forms the core of a DEEP-wide CoP. Ideas, information, and events are shared through a learning management system provided by the NATO DEEP eAcademy. The goal is to transform the relationship between the faculty development group and the master instructors into one of collaboration through this DEEP-wide CoP.

The PfPC's faculty development group has been actively collaborating with other working groups involved in teaching and learning methodologies. This collaboration helps these working groups connect with faculty from recipient institutions, promote student-centered active learning to wider audiences, and gain expertise, particularly in the realm of diverse perspectives.

One of the most notable collaborations focused on integrating a gender perspective into military education. Between 2010 and 2016, the Security Sector Reform (SSR) and the Education Development working groups of the PfPC joined forces to explore content and methods for integrating gender-related topics into their activities. In 2012, these two working groups launched a collaborative program focused on teaching gender in military contexts. The program consisted of four workshops held at various locations: the NATO School in Oberammergau (July 2012), the George C. Marshall European Center for Security Studies in Garmisch-Partenkirchen (December 2012), and two sessions in Geneva (December 2013 and July 2014). The workshops emphasized the need to enhance the capabilities of both educators and military gender experts – specifically, to improve military educators' ability to integrate gender topics into their curricula and to strengthen the capacity of military gender experts to effectively deliver educational content. Additionally, two Women, Peace, and Security (WPS) online courses were developed in conjunction with NATO Allied Command for Transformation.

The culmination of this collaboration was the publication of the *Teaching Gender in the Military* handbook,[15] published in 2016. It compiled the knowledge and insights derived from the four workshops. In addition to answering the question "what to teach" regarding gender and the Women, Peace, and Security agenda in the military, the handbook also provided practical guidance for military educators on "how to teach" gender-related topics and how to incorporate gender considerations effectively into their curricula and teaching methods. The handbook was translated into several languages and used in many countries. In 2024, it was decided to review and update the handbook, and as of this writing, revision efforts are ongoing. Since 2022, the DEEP faculty development group has been collaborating with the PfPC's Women, Peace, and Security in Professional Military Education (WPS in PME) Group. Two workshops, conducted in 2022 and 2024, demonstrated how active learning approaches can incorporate WPS.

Additionally, since 2021, the DEEP faculty development group has been working with the NATO DEEP eAcademy, providing methodology modules in their former e-Instructor Certificate Program and newly launched Online Teaching Fundamentals Course.

EDWG's Faculty Development Group

DEEP faculty development programs are planned, managed, and executed by a dedicated team within the PfPC EDWG. This faculty development group was established in 2006 as an ad hoc team focused on conducting the annual multinational programs mentioned above. While members of this group also formed teams for individual country DEEPs, planning for those events was primarily carried out by the teams implementing the individual programs.

With the conclusion of the multinational programs in 2015 and the expanded list of individual DEEPs, the planning team transitioned into a more formal group focused on designing multi-workshop faculty development programs for implementation in DEEP countries. As the group continued to develop and update its programs, it also began to consider its own approaches to teaching and learning in PME institutions. By 2019, the group's annual meetings included demonstrations and active discussions about emerging issues in military education. While the group continued managing and implementing multiple DEEP events each year, it also formed a community of practice centered on teaching in military education.

Volunteers have played a key role in all these processes, including faculty development events, since the very beginning of DEEP. Volunteers in the PfPC teams are instructors or faculty developers at their respective country's PME institutions. These instructors have made arrangements with their institutions, allowing them to spend three to four weeks each year conducting DEEP events

---

[15] *Teaching Gender in the Military: A Handbook* (Geneva: PfP Consortium and Geneva Centre for Security Sector Governance, 2016).

while still serving in their primary positions. Volunteers offer several advantages: the costs of individual programs are limited to transportation, lodging, per diem, and interpretation; they bring a highly motivated and knowledgeable group of workshop facilitators with significant credibility due to their professional backgrounds; and the nature of the work tends to attract individuals eager to share ideas and gain new perspectives.

At the same time, effective management of volunteers requires strong interpersonal and administrative skills. Developing good cross-cultural communication within the group is essential, as the members of the DEEP faculty development group are drawn from several countries. Accommodations must be made for the volunteer's accountability to their own institution, necessitating advanced planning to provide some degree of predictability for program schedules. Additionally, it is important to recognize and address the personal motivations of each volunteer. Lastly, there is an ongoing need for recruiting new team members to ensure sufficient capability and a balanced range of perspectives across the entire group.

Invitations to join the faculty development team initially targeted personnel from the Marshall Center, the NATO School in Oberammergau, and U.S. PME institutions. PME instructors from partner countries who had participated in earlier programs were also included. Members of the early group were typically subject matter experts in their academic fields rather than dedicated practitioners of faculty development. As DEEP faculty development events expanded into more comprehensive programs, volunteers from other NATO and partner countries were invited to join. Although there were no explicit criteria for team membership, the focus gradually shifted toward individuals actively engaged in faculty development at their institutions or with a professional interest in teaching and learning in PME.

The size of the teams and their workload during workshops have changed significantly since the group's inception. In the first few years, individual DEEP workshops typically involved four or five subject matter experts, while multinational programs included up to ten facilitators. As the group size expanded, the larger teams for the workshops provided both an onboarding experience and served as a trial run for new members. Additionally, because the PAP-DIB began without an established curriculum for the workshops, the larger teams allowed for exchanging ideas and topics. Many of the concepts and methods tested within these larger groups later became part of the standardized curriculum of the FFDP.

However, as the number of individual DEEP programs increased and their content became more established and formalized, the team size for a particular workshop was reduced to two members, with a third added for program cohorts of more than twenty. At the same time, the standardization of content also led to an increase in the number of modules being presented. Where earlier workshops provided three days of content, current programs now span around five

days (approximately 30 hours). The combined effect of smaller teams and expanded programs now requires volunteers who are conversant in a wide range of faculty development topics. As a result, the capabilities of each volunteer have become even more critical. Moreover, as the programs have focused more on the implementation and integration stages of educational transfer, faculty development expertise among group members has shifted from being preferred to being essential.

Expectations of Partner-State PME Institutions

Since the inception of the faculty development program, its audience has expanded significantly in scope, reflecting the shifting needs and interests of these participants. In the initial years, the focus of individual DEEP programs was primarily on higher education PME institutions in post-Soviet republics. A significantly different group of institutions participated in some of the more recent programs – officer accession academies and technical schools in Colombia, Tunisia, and Morocco. While the scope of participants has broadened, the conditions and environments in which military institutions operate have also changed considerably. It is worth noting that in June 2007, the first iPhone was released – just one month after the first multinational program at the NATO Defense College. Today, the DEEP faculty development group works with instructors and institutions grappling with the ubiquity of smartphones and their students' ready access to artificial intelligence tools.

The original multinational programs invited institutional leadership and introduced them to the pedagogical concepts to promote at their institutions. Meanwhile, the country-specific DEEPs provided the techniques and approaches for instructors and professors to apply in classrooms of senior PME institutions. The focus was on the leaders of institutions and instructors teaching senior officers commissioned in the Soviet system during the late 1970s and early 1980s. A common challenge for the DEEP teams was overcoming entrenched perspectives on military education. As noted in a presentation slide from the 2009 multinational program in Albania: "Nothing is more difficult than putting a new idea into the military mind, except removing an old one." [16]

These initial programs also focused on the post-Soviet republics, which were either seeking to establish their national PME institutions or to shift existing ones away from Soviet-style pedagogy. Moreover, in the early 2000s, these institutions were open to DEEP programs, with their underlying assumptions of Western values such as democracy, gender equality, and diverse perspectives. The institutional goal was to upgrade programs to meet NATO and even EU educational standards.

---

[16] Jeronim Bazo, "Thinking about Contemporary Ways of Teaching and Learning," presentation at the 3rd Annual Defense Educators' Program, 2009, rephrazing the famous quote from Basil H. Liddell Hart, *Thoughts on War* (London: Faber & Faber, 1944), 115.

The post-Soviet context became less relevant as programs expanded into Iraq, North Africa, and South America. These partner states had already established PME institutions and were not seeking to break away from an old system but rather looking to DEEP for modern approaches to PME instruction. In many of these countries, existing beliefs on democracy and gender were less open to change. While DEEP pedagogical approaches remain grounded in the assumption of democratic and intellectual plurality, the message had to be more implicit than explicit.

Beyond the shift in state profiles and their expectations, technological progress also changed how instructors receive the faculty development programs and process the content. In 2009, the learning theory of Connectivism was presciently introduced at the Multinational Educators Workshop held in Albania.[17] Connectivism's fundamental assumption is that learning occurs continuously through the discovery and navigation of online networks.[18] The implications of this insight are now obvious: students learn from the moment they check their phones in the morning until they last scroll before going to bed. Consequently, military educators, within their finite class time, must be able to compete for and exploit their students' continual access to information.

DEEP faculty development teams find themselves in a similar position. Their credibility can no longer be based on being the sole holders of facts or insightful models of modern teaching. These are readily available on the Internet, often found in far more entertaining YouTube videos. Today, faculty development teams face a more compelling task: demonstrating the value of social interaction in learning, even as they teach techniques for effectively integrating technology into the classroom.

Stages of Educational Transfer

The changes over the past 18 years in faculty development programs, within the DEEP Faculty Development Group, and in the expectations of participating institutions all have implications for the extent to which PfPC's pedagogical approaches have been transferred into the defense institutions of partner states. The educational transfer model by Phillips and Ochs allows for considering these three factors across the four stages that lead to the internalization of pedagogical approaches. Table 5 provides a summary of these stages and the associated considerations for institutions participating in DEEP faculty development.

For Phillips and Ochs, educational transfer begins with a cross-national attraction, where the borrowing state or institution is drawn to another system of education. This attraction often stems from a recognition of the inadequacies in the existing system and a belief in the superiority of an alternative system. While cross-national attraction is typically driven by the pursuit of a better institutional

---

[17] Kathaleen Reid-Martinez, "From Yesterday to Today – What's Happening in Approaches to Education," presentation at the 3rd Annual Defense Educators' Program, 2009.

[18] Siemens, "Connectivism: A Learning Theory for the Digital Age."

Table 5. Stages of Educational Transfer and DEEP Faculty Development.[19]

Stage of Transfer	Issues for Participating Institutions
Cross-National Attraction – Why is DEEP program desired?	• Pragmatic – the focus is on improving educational systems • Political – focus is on improving relationships with PfPC or NATO
Decision – How will DEEP materials be used?	• Theoretical – seeking new pedagogic approaches • Practical – seeking specific skills/concepts • Phony – superficial application • Quick Fix – application without reflection
Implementation – How will DEEP materials be adapted?	• Legitimacy and perceived expertise of the DEEP Team • Expectations and motivations of the participating instructors • Commitment and engagement of institutional leadership
Internalization – How will DEEP materials transform into institutional materials?	• Engagement in Communities of Practice focused on scholarship of teaching and learning • Institutional Master Instructor Program • Collaborative engagements with PfPC

system, it can also be influenced by political externalities.[20] Affiliation with another state's educational system can also lead to stronger political affiliation. In fact, this pragmatic/political dichotomy is an explicitly stated purpose of the PfPC: to "pursue intellectual interoperability among Allies and Partners by strengthening Partner defense and security institutions, enhancing cross-sector cooperation, and promoting modern standards for professional military education." [21]

The balance between pragmatic and political considerations provides an interesting distinction when considering the recipients of faculty development programs. The original states participating in DEEP sought to build or revise existing institutions. Those countries that already had PME institutions were still

---

[19] Based on the Education Transfer Model from Phillips and Ochs, "Processes of Policy Borrowing in Education: Some Analytical and Explanatory Devices."

[20] Phillips and Ochs, "Processes of Policy Borrowing in Education: Some Analytical and Explanatory Devices," 452.

[21] The Partnership for Peace Consortium of Defense Academies and Security Studies Institutes, *25th Anniversary Commitment Letter*, signed June 14, 2024.

grappling with outdated Soviet approaches to military education. While there was a political drive to affiliate with NATO and EU countries through the PfPC, there was a clear, pragmatic goal of improving the educational standards of their PME institutions. It is, therefore, unsurprising that discussions on the Bologna Process were included in the early multinational workshops.

The states now participating in DEEP exhibit a different mix of pragmatic and political motivations. The current group includes the same post-Soviet states as before, but now with developed PME institutions. It also includes new states without a Soviet background and with long-established PME institutions. The student-centered learning approaches that began to emerge twenty years ago are now much more internationalized and commonplace, to the point that the PfPC is competing in a global market of pedagogy providers. PME in a partner country is no longer a stand-alone institution; rather, it reflects the existing educational principles, methodologies, and competencies that shape how knowledge is imparted and internalized within the country. While the political drive to associate with NATO and the European Union may still persist, the pragmatic impulse is not as strong. Recipient countries may now be more discerning and selective in what they seek from their DEEP programs.

The cross-national attractions establish the conditions that lead to the next stage of education transfer. When accepting a program, institutional leaders must decide how the program will be treated. Is the institution seeking broader concepts or specific curricula? Institutions may be looking for a quick fix, which can lead to unrealistic expectations about the program. It is also possible that institutions merely seek the symbolism or certification of having completed a DEEP program. A leader's decision on how to accept the new pedagogy can be influenced by the structure of the program itself, as well as the leader's awareness and preconceptions about it.

The earlier activities within the individual DEEP and multinational programs tended to be in the form of singular events. While the individual DEEPs involved extensive discussions with institutions about their needs, initial site surveys did not include a detailed breakdown of the faculty development events offered, nor did they set clear expectations for the institutions. In contrast, the multinational events did not involve preparatory or post-event commitments from the participating states or institutions. This differs from the more structured three-workshop sequence of the FFDP and the four events of the MIP. Because these programs are pre-established, receiving institutions are more aware of the obligations they incur by accepting them, potentially limiting symbolic participation and curbing the expectations of those seeking quick fixes.

Several contextual factors affect the successful implementation of a program, but the expectations of individual participants and the perceived competence and expertise of the DEEP team are paramount. The initial goal was to provide information from the PfPC to the participating schools in earlier programs. While there was active engagement in workshops, the flow of information was predominantly one-way: from the DEEP team to the workshop participants, focusing

on transferring student-centered learning concepts and methods. This model has since evolved as access to learning methodologies has become widely available online, and the general concepts have already been disseminated.

The value of the DEEP team lies not only in the knowledge they bring but also in the collaboration and guidance they offer to participating instructors as those instructors seek out new learning concepts and merge them with existing approaches. DEEP teams are increasingly shifting from behaviorist and cognitivist approaches in their workshops to constructivist and connectivist methods, as anticipated during the multinational workshop in Albania in 2009.

Finally, to achieve internalization in educational transfer, the new pedagogical approaches must be fully embraced and integrated into the institution. Such internalization cannot occur through three FFDP workshops or a single cycle of educational transfer. The development of the MIP and the Sustainability Program reflects this reality. The purpose of the MIP is to enable instructors to analyze PfPC educational concepts and adapt them to their institution's context. It also requires institutional leadership buy-in to implement the faculty development program effectively. Even after implementation, ongoing support is essential to ensure these programs become an integral part of the institution's memory. Meaningful change demands regular interactions to engage new leadership, reinforce developments, and provide sustained support and resources for instructors and leaders pursuing these changes.

Conclusions

In considering the future direction of DEEP faculty development so that it remains relevant over the next two decades, this retrospective highlights several factors. First, regarding partner countries and their institutions, they are becoming more nuanced and discerning when assessing the value of DEEP faculty development programs. While the DEEP faculty development group cannot influence the political motives for accepting a DEEP program, it can shape pragmatic decisions by maintaining leading-edge programs. Consequently, the faculty development group must be more actively engaged in the scholarship of teaching and learning in PME to ensure that its programs retain value and relevance for participating institutions.

DEEP faculty development programs should be regularly reviewed and updated to reflect ongoing changes in adult education and education-related technology. The overall approach of the faculty development programs is shifting from PfPC providing knowledge during workshops to PfPC facilitating the exchange of knowledge and ideas between instructors and institutions. While FFDP and MIP have been successfully executed, new programs should be considered to allow collaborative exploration of issues such as the impact of artificial intelligence on learning or intellectual pluralism in PME. Finally, program descriptions should be more concrete and explicit, including clear expectations for institu-

tions and methods for formative assessment. These descriptions should be readily accessible to program leads, country academic leads, and the institutions themselves.

Continuous development of program materials and concepts requires introducing new ideas into the faculty development group. This necessitates a purposeful recruitment program for new members, ensuring a continual influx of fresh ideas and a diverse array of faculty development professionals from NATO and partner countries.

Disclaimer

The views expressed in this article are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the official policies of the Partnership for Peace Consortium or its governance stakeholders.

About the Authors

John O. Hagen, Ph.D., teaches international security studies for the U.S. Air Command and Staff College's online Master's program and courses in instructional program design for Park University's M.Ed. in Leading Adult and Organizational Learning. He is a certified Master Instructor for the U.S. Air Force. Dr. Hagen is Co-lead of the NATO DEEP (Defense Education Enhancement Program) Faculty Development Group within the Partnership for Peace Consortium Education Development Working Group. He has been leading academic teams for DEEP since 2017 and has worked with military institutions in Armenia, Mauritania, Tunisia, and Uzbekistan. Additionally, he has led faculty development programs in military institutions in Niger, Chad, and Mozambique.
E-mail: hagenjohn@mac.com

Iryna Lysychkina, Ph.D., is an Associate Professor and Chair of the Department of Philology, Translation, and Strategic Communication at the National Academy of the National Guard of Ukraine. She serves as Co-lead for the NATO DEEP Faculty Development Group within the Partnership for Peace Consortium Education Development Working Group. Since 2009, Dr. Lysychkina has conducted numerous faculty development workshops in 14 countries. Additionally, as a Senior Instructional Designer at the NATO DEEP eAcademy, she teaches methodology for distance learning. *E-mail*: ilysychkina@nangu.edu.ua
https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2050-9379

Bibliography

"Defence Education Enhancement Program (DEEP)," *What We Do*, NATO, September 24, 2024, https://www.nato.int/cps/en/natohq/topics_139182.htm.

"Istanbul Summit Readers Guide," NATO, 2004, accessed October 30, 2024, https://www.nato.int/docu/rdr-gde-ist/rdr-gde-ist-e.pdf.

Bazo, Jeronim, "Thinking about Contemporary Ways of Teaching and Learning," presentation at the 3rd Annual Defense Educators' Program, 2009.

Berry, John, "Defense Education Enhancement Program: The Consortium Perspective," *Connections: The Quarterly Journal* 11, no. 4 (2012): 27-33, https://doi.org/10.11610/Connections.11.4.03

d'Andurain, Jean, and Alan G. Stolberg, "Defense Education Enhancement Program: The NATO Functional Clearing-House on Defense Education," *Connections: The Quarterly Journal* 11, no. 4 (2012): 53-58, https://doi.org/10.11610/Connections.11.4.06.

Faculty Development Curriculum Guide, NATO and PfP Consortium, last updated June 7, 2023, https://www.nato.int/cps/en/natohq/topics_213129.htm.

Hennessey, Megan J., "Identifying, Developing, and Assessing Instructor Competencies in Outcomes-based Military Education," *New Directions for Teaching and Learning* 173 (2023): 23-32, https://doi.org/10.1002/tl.20531.

Liddell Hart, Basil H., *Thoughts on War* (London: Faber & Faber, 1944), 115.

Phillips, David, and Kimberly Ochs, "Processes of Policy Borrowing in Education: Some Analytical and Explanatory Devices," *Comparative Education* 39, no. 4 (2003): 451-461, https://doi.org/10.1080/0305006032000162020.

Pouliot, Vincent, "The Essence of Constructivism," *Journal of International Relations and Development* 7 (2004): 319–336, https://doi.org/10.1057/palgrave.jird.1800022.

Reid-Martinez, Kathaleen, "From Yesterday to Today – What's Happening in Approaches to Education," presentation at the 3rd Annual Defense Educators' Program, 2009.

Reid-Martinez, Kathaleen, "Overcoming the Challenge of Legacy Learning Methods," *Connections: The Quarterly Journal* 11, no. 4 (2012): 43-51, https://doi.org/10.11610/Connections.11.4.05.

Siemens, George, "Connectivism: A Learning Theory for the Digital Age," *International Journal of Instructional Technology and Distance Learning* 2, no. 1 (2005), http://www.itdl.org/Journal/Jan_05/article01.htm.

Teaching Gender in the Military: A Handbook (Geneva: PfP Consortium and Geneva Centre for Security Sector Governance, 2016).

Wenger-Trayner, Etienne, and Beverly Wenger-Trayner, "An Introduction to Communities of Practice: A Brief Overview of the Concept and Its Uses," 2015, accessed October 30, 2024, https://www.wenger-trayner.com/introduction-to-communities-of-practice.

Whitzman, Carolyn, "'Culture Eats Strategy for Breakfast': The Powers and Limitations of Urban Design Education," *Journal of Urban Design* 21 (2016): 574-576, https://doi.org/10.1080/13574809.2016.1220157.