

AD-A272 858



2

BATTALION LEVEL
OFFICER LEADER DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS:
DEVELOPING A MODEL FOR SUCCESS

A thesis presented to the Faculty of the U.S. Army
Command and General Staff College in partial
fulfillment of the requirements for the
degree

MASTER OF MILITARY ART AND SCIENCE



by

SAMUELL R. HAWES, CPT(P), USA
B.A., Texas A&M University, College Station, Texas, 1981

Fort Leavenworth, Kansas
1993

Approved for public release; distribution is unlimited.

93-28147



93 11 13 096

DOCUMENTATION PAGE

Form Approved

OMB No. 0704-0188

Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 1 hour per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to Washington Headquarters Services, Directorate for Information Operations and Reports, 1215 Jefferson Davis Highway, Suite 1204, Arlington, VA 22202-4302, and to the Office of Management and Budget, Paperwork Reduction Project (0704-0188), Washington, DC 20503.

1. AGENCY USE ONLY (Leave blank)		2. REPORT DATE 4 June 1993	3. REPORT TYPE AND DATES COVERED Master's Thesis, 1 Aug 93-4 Jun 93
4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE Battalion Level Officer Leader Development Programs: Developing A Model For Success			5. FUNDING NUMBERS
6. AUTHOR(S) CPT Samuel R. Hawes, USA			
7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) U.S. Army Command and General Staff College Attn: AZTL-SWD-GD Ft. Leavenworth, KS 66027-6900			8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER
9. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES)			10. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY REPORT NUMBER
11. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES			
12a. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY STATEMENT Approved for Public Release; distribution is unlimited.			12b. DISTRIBUTION CODE
13. ABSTRACT (Maximum 200 words) This study seeks to identify a model for battalion-level officer leader development. It examines most current doctrine and literature regarding leader development. This study defines the requirement for officer leader development based on doctrinal and current thought. It then uses the information to develop a model for battalion-level officer leader development. It also uses officer leader development vignettes to illustrate the components of the proposed model through notional leaders. Current doctrine and the proposed model were evaluated by students in the Pre-Command Course at Fort Leavenworth, Kansas. The study concludes that the current FM 25-101, Battle Focused Training, model for officer leader development is inadequate. It recommends the development of a training circular to provide specific techniques for unit-level leader development.			
14. SUBJECT TERMS Leader Development, Officer Leader Development, Leadership			15. NUMBER OF PAGES 89
			16. PRICE CODE
17. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF REPORT UNCLASSIFIED	18. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE UNCLASSIFIED	19. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF ABSTRACT UNCLASSIFIED	20. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT

**BATTALION LEVEL
OFFICER LEADER DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS:
DEVELOPING A MODEL FOR SUCCESS**

**A thesis presented to the Faculty of the U.S. Army
Command and General Staff College in partial
fulfillment of the requirements for the
degree**

MASTER OF MILITARY ART AND SCIENCE

by

**SAMUELL R. HAWES, CPT(P), USA
B.A., Texas A&M University, College Station, Texas, 1981**

**Fort Leavenworth, Kansas
1993**

Approved for public release; distribution is unlimited.

MASTER OF MILITARY ART AND SCIENCE


THESIS APPROVAL PAGE

Name of Candidate: CPT(P) Samuel R. Hawes

Thesis Title: Battalion Level Officer Leader Development
Programs: Developing a Model for Success


Approved by:


BG William M. Steele, M.A., Thesis Committee Chairman


MAJ Benjamin H. Taylor III, M.B.A., Member


BG Gerald A. Miller, Ph.D., Member, Consulting Faculty

Accepted this 4th day of June 1993 by:


Philip J. Brookes, Ph.D., Director, Graduate Degree Programs

The opinions and conclusions expressed herein are those of the student author and do not necessarily represent the views of the U.S. Army Command and General Staff College or any other governmental agency. (References to this study should include the foregoing statement.)

ABSTRACT

A MODEL FOR OFFICER LEADER DEVELOPMENT, by CPT(P) Samuel R. Hawes, USA, 89 pages

This study seeks to identify a model for battalion-level officer leader development. It examines most current doctrine and literature regarding leader development.

This study defines the requirement for officer leader development based on doctrinal and current thought. It then uses the information to develop a model for battalion-level officer leader development. It also uses officer leader development vignettes to illustrate the components of the proposed model through notional leaders. Current doctrine and the proposed model were evaluated by students in the Pre-Command Course at Fort Leavenworth, Kansas.

The study concludes that the current FM 25-101, Battle Focused Training, model for officer leader development is inadequate. It recommends the development of a training circular to provide specific techniques for unit-level leader development.

DTIC QUALITY INSPECTED 8

Approved for Distribution	
NHS Date	
By	
Distribution	
Availability Codes	
Dist	Avail and/or Special
A-1	

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Writing this thesis has been a major task, which was made possible with the assistance of many individuals. I want to express my gratitude to some of those who have assisted and provided me with motivation during this research project.

First, I want to thank my wife and family for their support. The time I could have devoted to them was spent in front of a desk or computer. Without their support and understanding, this thesis would not have been completed.

Second, I wish to thank the members of my research committee, BG William Steele, BG Gerald Miller, and MAJ Ben Taylor who provided me with assistance and encouragement. Their time, attention, and patience involved in this project is greatly appreciated.

Next, are the numerous individuals who helped me clarify my thoughts on the subject of leader development. Dr. Mettlin, LTC Sterner, LTC Keohane, and members of my MMAS study group. Finally, I want to acknowledge my Academic Counselor and Evaluator, LTC Smith. Without his constant encouragement and example I would not have been able to complete this project.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
APPROVAL PAGE	ii
ABSTRACT.	iii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.	iv
LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS	vii
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS	viii
 CHAPTER	
1. INTRODUCTION.	1
Background	1
Problem Statement and Research Question	4
Assumptions	5
Definitions	5
Limitations and Delimitations	9
Significance of the Study	9
2. REVIEW OF LITERATURE	11
Doctrinal Literature	11
Military Publications	23
Summary	32
3. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY.	33
Methodology	33
Proposed Battalion-Level Officer Leader Development Model	35
Military Qualification Standards (MQS)	38
Leader Development Phases	39
Assessment, Feedback, and Counseling.	42
Assignments	45
Unit Training	46
Professional Development.	46
Self-Development.	47
Institutional Training.	48
4. APPLICATION OF THE MODEL.	49
Application of the Model.	49
2/23 Infantry Battalion	49
Leadership Vignettes.	51
Battalion S-3	51
Platoon Leader.	54

Battalion S-2	56
Battalion S-4	59
HHC Commander	61
Scout Platoon Leader.	63
Professional Development.	64
5. ANALYSIS & DISCUSSION	66
Leader Development Phases	68
Assessment, Feedback, and Counseling.	70
MQS	70
Self-development.	71
Institutional Training and Assignments.	72
6. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	73
Conclusions	73
Recommendations	76
Recommendations for Further Study	77
ENDNOTES	79
APPENDIX. SURVEY	82
BIBLIOGRAPHY	86
INITIAL DISTRIBUTION LIST	89

LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS

Table	Page
1. Leader Development Program Components	26
2. Omega Force Duty Positions.	29
3. Leader Development Vignettes.	50
4. ORB Summary--MAJ Smith.	52
5. ORB Summary--2LT Hope	54
6. ORB Summary--1LT Boyd	57
7. ORB Summary--CPT Davis.	60
8. ORB Summary--CPT Walker	62
9. ORB Summary--1LT Smith.	63
 Figure	
1. The Leader Development Process.	6
2. Proposed Battalion-level Officer Leader Development Model	38

ABBREVIATIONS

AAR	After Action Review
APFT	Army Physical Fitness Test
CAPT	Captain
CAS3	Combined Arms and Services Staff School
CPX	Command Post Exercise
CTC	Combat Training Centers
CTG	Command Training Guidance
CGSC	Command and General Staff College
CTT	Common Task Training
EDRE	Emergency Deployment Readiness Exercise
EER	Enlisted Evaluation Report
FM	Field Manual
JOLDS	Junior Officer Leader Development Study
LOGEX	Logistics Exercise
LT	Lieutenant
LTC	Lieutenant Colonel
MAJ	Major
METL	Mission Essential Task List
MQS	Military Qualification Standards
MTP	Mission Training Plans
NCO	Non-Commissioned Officer
OER	Officer Evaluation Report

ORB	Officer Record Brief
PCC	Pre-Command Course
PK	Professional Knowledges
PMCS	Preventative Maintenance Checks and Services
SGS	Secretary of the General Staff
SOP	Standard Operating Procedures
STX	Situational Training Exercise
TEWT	Tactical Exercise Without Troops
XO	Executive Officer

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

At all levels, the next senior leader has the responsibility to create leader development programs that develop professional officer and NCO leaders. Leaders train their subordinates to plan training carefully, execute it aggressively.... Effective leader development programs will continuously influence the Army as younger leaders progress to higher levels of responsibility.¹

FM 100-5, Operations

Background

During the 1980's the U.S. Army conducted significant research and discussion in the development of military leadership. This resulted primarily from the advent of the Army's new AirLand Battle doctrine espoused in Field Manual (FM) 100-5, Operations. This new doctrine, and its requirement for initiative on the part of individual leaders, placed a premium on effective military leadership. FM 100-5's description of leadership drives the requirement for effective leader development:

The most essential element of combat power is competent and confident leadership. Leadership provides purpose, direction, and motivation in combat. It is the leader who will determine the degree to which maneuver, firepower, and protection are maximized; who will ensure these

elements are effectively balanced; and who will decide how to bring them to bear against the enemy.²

In 1987 the Army Chief of Staff directed that a study be conducted to assess the state of leader development in the Army and to determine what changes would be needed to carry the Army into the 1990's. What followed was the Leader Development Study in 1987, and the Leader Development Action Plan in 1988.

The Leader Development Action Plan made fifty-two specific recommendations to the Army Chief of Staff concerning future leader development. The plan also noted the importance of unit training to the growth of leaders and revealed that there was "considerable disparity in the quality of Officer Professional Development programs throughout the force."³ Recommendation number thirty-seven specifically addressed this disparity and recommended that a field users' pamphlet be developed to assist in the professional development of leaders by:

- Describing the responsibility of schools, individual officers, and their leaders.
- Tying the professional development of leaders to FM 25-100, Mission Essential Task Lists (METL) and other FM 25-series training manuals.
- Focusing on development of the warfighting skills within battalions which are necessary to execute the doctrine addressed in FM 100-5.
- Reinforcing leadership doctrine addressed in FM 22-100 and FM 22-103.
- Providing models to improve professional development programs in units.⁴

The recommendations from these studies resulted in the development of DA PAM 600-32, Leader Development for the Total Army (1991). The pamphlet outlines the Army's leader development program for officers, noncommissioned officers, warrant officers, and civilians. It further describes leader development through the three pillars of leader development: institutional training, operational assignments, and self development. The operational assignments pillar gives unit commanders the responsibility for developing leader development programs.

FM 25-101, Battle Focused Training (1990) applies the Army's leader development program encompassed in DA PAM 600-32 and FM 25-100, Training the Force (1988). FM 25-101 is designed specifically to assist leaders in the development and execution of training programs. It provides a general guide, which illustrates how a leader development program might be structured.

In 1992, the CSA directed that the Junior Officer Leader Development Study (JOLDS) be conducted to identify concerns and propose solutions regarding the Army's junior officers. The study involved interviewing officers throughout the Army to gather data concerning leader development, leadership competencies, counseling, evaluation, and certification programs. JOLDS made the following conclusions and recommendations that relate directly to this study:

- Junior officers do not consider unit leader development programs to be effective.
- The key ingredient in leader development programs is the commander. Commanders must provide emphasis, time, and resources for the program to be effective.
- Junior officers are not receiving adequate counseling and feedback. Standards are not communicated, feedback is not substantive, support forms are not being used properly, and counseling is viewed as negative.
- Junior officers are not satisfied with the current OER system.
- Existing leader certification programs are viewed as excellent.
- A training circular is needed to describe unit-level leader development.⁵

The role of the unit officer leader development program is often considered as an afterthought when developing the unit's training plan. It is absolutely critical, however, to the unit's ability to execute its assigned wartime missions. The officer leader development program must be battle focused and specifically tailored to support the unit's Mission Essential Task List (METL), while at the same time adapting to the needs of each individual leader and their self development requirements.

Problem Statement and Research Question

The primary research question which must be answered is this: Is the U.S. Army's officer leader development model adequate? To answer this question, several other questions concerning Army doctrine must first be addressed:

- What is the current officer leader development model?
- What are the strengths of the current model?

--What are the weaknesses of the current model?

--What changes should be made to the current model?

The problem, simply stated, is to identify a leader development model that is applicable at the battalion level.

Assumptions

This project assumes that the officers interviewed and surveyed in the Command and General Staff College (CGSC) and the Pre-Command Course (PCC) represent an adequate cross section of the officer corps of the U.S. Army to draw conclusions concerning leader development programs.

Definitions

Since the project will deal exclusively with a specific portion of military leadership doctrine, the requirement exists to establish the exact meanings of the key terms used in this paper. Standard doctrinal terms are used whenever possible to describe ideas or activities relating to leader development.

The Leader Development Process: Officer leader development is a process, by which officers are developed through a carefully designed progression of schools, job experiences, and individually initiated activities. A graphical representation of the Leader Development Process is provided at Figure 1.6




Figure 1. The Leader Development Process. Source: DA PAM 600-32.

Battle Focus: DA PAM 600-32 requires leader development programs to be battle focused and support the unit's METL. Battle focus is "the process of deriving

peacetime training requirements from wartime missions."⁷ All training must be battle focused to insure that limited resources are used effectively and to insure leaders and units are ready for combat.

METL: A unit's METL is the "compilation of collective mission essential tasks in which a unit must be proficient to accomplish an appropriate portion of its wartime mission(s)."⁸ The unit's METL is derived from the mission, or missions, the unit is most likely to conduct during wartime. This process, along with battle focus, is used to insure that units use resources and time wisely to focus training on those missions they will most likely face in combat.

Battalion: This study is concerned specifically with leader development programs at the battalion-level. For the purpose of this study a battalion-size unit is an active or reserve component unit assigned to a division organization. It consists of two or more companies and is commanded by a U.S. Army lieutenant colonel. Army battalions are categorized by combat arms, combat support, and combat service support. For the purpose of this thesis, Army battalions include the following units normally found within a division organization:

- Combat Arms Battalions
 - Infantry
 - Armor
 - Field Artillery

- Cavalry
- Aviation
- Air Defense
- Engineer
- Combat Support Battalions
 - Signal
 - Military Intelligence
- Combat Service Support Battalions
 - Forward Support
 - Main Support

Assessment: A method used to determine, from performance, the proficiency and potential of a leader. An assessment should be an objective judgment compared against a standard. Also, it should also be non-threatening, unbiased, and uninflated. An assessment should not be confused with an evaluation.⁹

Feedback: An intermediate step between assessment and evaluation. Feedback should be clear and related to the process or standard. It should be presented in a positive way and should allow the individual to self-discover strengths and weaknesses. Assessment feedback can include face to face discussions, notes, counseling forms, peer and subordinate comments, and leadership after action reviews.¹⁰

Counseling: Counseling should summarize a leader's performance after numerous feedback opportunities. It includes recommendations for overall improvement and provides the subordinate with a rating in the form of an evaluation.¹¹

Evaluation: A formal rating of previous assessments, feedback, and reinforcement or remediation efforts. It is a

formal and documented record of performance covering a specified period of time.¹²

Limitations

The scope of this thesis is limited to officer leader development programs at the battalion-level. It will be limited to those principles that apply to the battalion commander in his quest to develop leader development programs to fit the needs of the unit.

This study is also limited by time and resources. This impacts primarily on the ability to survey a larger representation of the Army. Additionally, it restricts the ability to gather information and examples of leader development programs from active and reserve component battalions throughout the Army.

Significance of the Study

If successful, this study will have two major areas of significance to the U.S. Army. First, the study will provide answers to the research questions regarding battalion-level officer leader development. Secondly, this study will provide a model for battalion-level officer leader development programs that is consistent with current Army leadership doctrine. The model will also encompass the ideas expressed by a cross section of Army officers representing

units throughout the Army. Finally, the model will provide sufficient information to battalion-level commanders to develop viable programs within their units.

CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

No study of military doctrine can be considered complete until the available literature has been examined closely. This chapter will review two distinct types of literature. The first consists of doctrinal publications relating to leader development. Review of this material establishes the doctrinal basis for leader development and the current doctrinal body of knowledge concerning officer leader development. The second type of literature consists of published and unpublished material concerning leader development. Its purpose is to review the current non-doctrinal body of knowledge concerning leadership development.

Doctrinal Literature

The purpose of the doctrinal literature is to establish the doctrinal basis for leader development in the U.S. Army. The Army uses Field Manuals (FM) as its primary means of establishing and communicating doctrine. The Army establishes the fundamental importance of leadership development in its basic doctrinal manual, FM 100-1, The Army. I will trace the Army's doctrine for leader development through the following U.S. Army Publications:

FM 100-1, The Army
FM 100-5, Operations
FM 22-100, Military Leadership
DA PAM 600-32, Leadership for the Total Army
FM 22-101, Counseling
FM 25-100, Training the Force
FM 25-101, Battle Focused Training
DA PAM 600-3, Commissioned Officer Development and
Career Management
STP 21-11-MQS, Military Qualification Standards II
FC 22-10, The Commanders Guide to Leader Development
(Coordinating Draft)

FM 100-1, The Army (1991), provides the springboard for our warfighting doctrine. It documents the broad roles and missions for the Army and how these support our national security. It also establishes standards for the quality of Army leadership by establishing the three pillars of leadership development: "formal education, professional experience, and self-development."¹

FM 100-5, Operations (1986), is the Army's keystone warfighting doctrinal manual. It provides the foundation for all subordinate doctrine, force design, material acquisition, professional education, individual training, and unit training. It also serves as the Army's principal tool for professional self-education in the science and art of war.

FM 100-5 identifies leadership as an important element of AirLand Battle doctrine. It establishes that:

Superior combat power is generated through a commander's skillful combination of the elements of maneuver, firepower, protection, and leadership in a sound plan flexibly but forcefully executed. Of these, leadership is considered the most important.²

FM 100-5 also encourages officers to study the military profession and prepare for war.

FM 22-100, Military Leadership (1990), is the Army's basic manual on leadership. Its principal focus is on junior leaders and soldiers at the battalion-level and below. This focus makes it an excellent source document for identifying the key components of leadership that a leader development program must address.

It first addresses the fundamental expectations of soldiers and other leaders that all leaders must fulfill. Fulfilling these expectations is key to the junior officer when dealing with subordinates. The fundamental expectations for leaders include:

- Demonstrate tactical and technical competence
- Teach subordinates
- Be a good listener
- Treat soldiers with dignity and respect
- Stress basics
- Set the example
- Set and enforce standards³

FM 22-100 recognizes that "at all levels, the next senior leader has the responsibility to create leader development programs that develop professional officer and NCO leaders."⁴ Leaders are charged with the ethical development of their subordinates and must serve as role models. Leaders must also develop and nurture trust that encourages leaders to delegate and empower subordinates.

FM 22-100 establishes 11 principles of Army leadership. These principles serve as an excellent guide for improving leadership ability. The principles of Army leadership include:

- Know yourself and seek self-improvement.
- Be technically and tactically proficient.
- Seek responsibility and take responsibility for your actions.
- Make sound and timely decisions.
- Set the example.
- Know your soldiers and look out for their well-being.
- Keep your subordinates informed.
- Develop a sense of responsibility in your subordinates.
- Ensure the task is understood, supervised, and accomplished.
- Build the team.
- Employ your unit in accordance with its capabilities.⁵

FM 22-100 also establishes nine leadership competencies to provide a framework for leadership development and assessment. These competencies were developed in 1976 from a study of leaders from the rank of corporal to general officer. They establish broad categories of skills, knowledge, and attitudes that define leader behavior. These competencies serve as an excellent tool for self-assessment and assessing the leadership of subordinates. The nine Leadership Competencies include:

- Communications
- Supervision
- Teaching and Counseling
- Soldier Team Development
- Technical and Tactical Proficiency
- Decision Making
- Planning

- Use of Available Systems
- Professional Ethics⁶

FM 22-100 provides the developmental leadership assessment process that a leader can use to develop and evaluate a subordinates ability to lead. The process involves "comparing performance to a standard or performance indicator, giving feedback, and developing a plan to improve leadership performance."⁷ Feedback can come from the person himself, leaders, peers, and subordinates.

The leadership assessment process uses the Leadership Competencies as a common framework for improving leadership. It should be conducted as follows:

- Decide what leadership skill, knowledge, or attitude you want to assess.
- Make a plan to observe the leadership performance.
- Observe the leadership performance and record your observations.
- Compare the leadership performance you observed to a standard or performance indicator.
- Decide if the leadership performance you observed exceeds, meets, or is below the standard or performance indicator.
- Give the person leadership performance feedback.
- Help the person develop an action plan to improve leadership performance.
- Design the action plan together.
- Agree on the actions necessary to improve leadership performance.
- Review the action plan frequently to see if the subordinate is making progress and to determine if the plan needs to be changed.⁸

FM 22-101, Leadership Counseling (1985), 's the Army's doctrinal manual on counseling. It is intended to broaden leaders' knowledge of military counseling through suggestions and guidelines. It contains only one absolute requirement:

"that leaders regularly counsel their soldiers."⁹ It further states that "the leader who neglects to counsel his subordinates is negligent in his performance of duty."¹⁰

FM 22-101 provides an excellent reference for the assessment and feedback required in a leader development program. However, due to its early publication, it fails to make a direct link between counseling and the current Army system for leader development.

DA PAM 600-32, Leader Development For The Total Army (1991), outlines the Army's leader development program for officers, warrant officers, NCOs, and Department of the Army civilian leaders. It addresses leader development responsibilities under three pillars: institutional training, operational assignments, and self development.

DA PAM 600-32 describes how leader development activities must be an integral part of each unit's training program. Programs must be battle focused, support the unit's METL and the professional development needs of junior leaders.¹¹

DA PAM 600-32 falls short in providing sufficient information for unit commanders to develop battalion-level leader development programs. This requirement is left for other doctrinal publications to accomplish.

FM 25-100, Training the Force (1988), is the Army's standardized training document that tells us how we must

train. It provides authoritative foundations for individual, leader, and unit training. It establishes that "leaders in the chain of command are responsible for developing and executing training plans that result in proficient individuals, leaders, and units."¹²

Leaders are responsible for creating leader development programs that develop a warfighter's professionalism--knowledge, attitudes, and skills. They mentor, guide, listen to, and "think with" subordinates to challenge their depth of knowledge and understanding.

Leader development should be included in a unit's Command Training Guidance (CTG), long-range training plan, and short-range training guidance. Training briefings should also include a discussion of leader development programs, with emphasis on officer warfighting skill development.

These requirements to brief leader development programs do have the effect of providing command emphasis. However, they also have the effect of causing commanders to think in terms of leader development events, or the weekly Officer Professional Development Class, instead of a process.

FM 25-101, Battle Focused Training (1990), applies the doctrine established in FM 25-100 and assists leaders in the development and execution of training programs. Commanders are required to train the trainers by developing junior leaders and ensure subordinate leaders understand and use

leader development programs. They must also assess leader development and provide developmental feedback and guidance as a coach, teacher, and mentor.

FM 25-101 provides a "how to" for unit-level leader development programs. The commander must develop a program that meets the needs of the organization and of the junior leaders. Unit-level leader development training, institutional training, and structured self-development must be incorporated into the unit's leader development program to develop leaders.

FM 25-101 provides a model for battalion and separate company level leader development. According to this model unit programs should include:

A Reception and Integration phase for incorporating new leaders into the unit.

A Basic Skills Development phase that brings the leader to minimum acceptable level of proficiency in critical tasks.

An Advanced Development and Sustainment phase that sustains basic skills, trains the leaders to a higher level of proficiency in critical tasks, and integrates the leader into the unit's continuing professional development program.¹³

Leader development programs must be driven by the units Mission Essential Task List (METL) and the professional

development needs of junior leaders. They also must be based on Army doctrine.

Institutional programs are the Army's system of formal resident training. Commanders should use these opportunities to train junior leaders in skills that are necessary to the individual and the unit.

Self-development programs enhance the leader's overall professional competency. The Military Qualification Standards (MQS) System is the Army's program for officer self-development.

A balanced unit program can also incorporate other proven professional development components. Examples are:

- Tactical exercises without troops (TEWTs).
- Terrain rides.
- Battle analysis seminars.
- Computer-assisted simulations.
- Certification programs.
- Shared experiences and periodic change of duty programs.
- Guest lectures.
- Unit professional associations.
- History classes and exhibits.
- Professional reading programs.¹⁴

DA PAM 600-3, Commissioned Officer Development And Career Management (Draft) (1993), provides guidance to individuals, commanders, proponents, and personnel managers for the development and career management of commissioned officers. It provides the specific steps that an officer should follow as he progresses in the Army. Each officer branch also provides a career model for active and reserve

component officers. This information is useful for unit commanders when assigning officers or providing career guidance.

The Military Qualification Standards System (MQS) is the Army's leader development system for officers. Its primary purpose is to provide officers, commanders, and school commandants with the framework for common and branch specific officer training requirements. The system requires branch school commandants to identify branch specific training requirements and assist in identifying common training requirements for officers and cadets. Unit commanders provide training on those MQS tasks which support the accomplishment of their unit's METL, while providing their subordinates both with an environment in which development can occur. However, the MQS system holds each individual officer ultimately responsible for his own development as a leader.

The MQS system addresses officer training from precommissioning to promotion to colonel. It is divided into three levels: MQS I, MQS II, and MQS III. Each level builds upon the preceding one. All levels of MQS include two components: a military task and knowledge component (critical tasks and professional knowledge areas) and a professional military education (PME) component.

STP 21-II-MQS, Military Qualification Standards II Manual of Common Tasks for Lieutenants and Captains (1991),

is designed specifically to provide common tasks and professional knowledges (PK) for company grade officers (lieutenants and captains), regardless of their branch. The MQS Common Task Areas include:

- AirLand Battle Doctrine
- Leadership
- Battlefield Operating Systems
 - Maneuver
 - Intelligence
 - Fire Support
 - Air Defense
 - Mobility, Counter-mobility, and Survivability
 - Combat Service Support
- Training
- History
- Soldier and Unit Support Systems
- Low Intensity Conflict
- Force Integration¹⁵

Common Professional Knowledge (PK) subjects provide information that an officer must know but is not directly observable. "PKs involve the use of mental processes which enable an individual to recall factors, identify concepts, apply rules or principles, and think creatively."¹⁶

MQS II also provides a professional military education component. The objective of this component is to teach officers to think critically, to have an appreciation of relevant military history, and to further the understanding of contemporary thinking in selected areas. This component consists of a reading program and, for selected officers, advanced civil schooling.

The reading program consists of nineteen books that form the foundation of each officers professional reading

program. These books give each officer a foundation in each of the eight categories of military related writing. The reading list categories include:

- General History
- Sustainment
- Technology
- Command and Leadership
- Nature of War
- Tactics or Warfighting
- Low Intensity Conflict¹⁷

STP 21-III-MQS, Military Qualification Standards II Manual of Common Tasks for Majors and Lieutenant Colonels (Coordinating Draft), addresses leader development for majors and lieutenant colonels. Like MQS II, MQS III provides the framework which integrates the development efforts of commandants, commanders, and individual officers. It relies on descriptions of general areas of knowledge, rather than the specific tasks of MQS II, to focus field grade officer leader development. MQS III also places a much greater emphasis on self development than MQS II.

The STP-II-MQS series of manuals provide branch specific tasks that qualify the company grade officer in a given branch. These MQS manuals also provide specific tasks that each branch component school must teach and validate.

FC 22-10, The Commanders Guide To Leader Development, Coordinating Draft (1985) is a coordinating draft training circular designed to provide a model for the professional development of unit leaders. Although this document never

made it to publication as an official document the basic concepts of the draft appear to be summarized in the current FM 25-101.

FC 22-10 provides an eighteen-page example of a battalion leader development program that provides specific examples of how to develop a leader development program. The phases of leader development described in the FC are similar to FM 25-101. These phases are Sponsorship and Reception, Basic Skills Development, and Advanced Development and Sustainment.

FC 22-10 provides excellent examples for leader development programs. However, it falls short in meeting the requirement for an effective leader development program. The organization of the FC gives emphasis to centralized professional development in the form of unit-level professional development classes and seminars. It fails to properly emphasize the importance of leader development as a process or realize the importance of assessment and feedback into the program.

Military Publications

There is a tremendous amount of literature currently available concerning leadership. There is, however, very little when you narrow the field to leadership development. While I have reviewed a significant amount of literature concerning leadership, I will limit my comments to the

information I found that relates directly to leadership development.

George Forsythe, Howard Prince, John Wattendorf, and Gayle Watkins authored "A Framework for Leader Development" in 1988. Their article resulted from comments in the 1985 Professional Development of Officers Study and the 1987 Leader Development Study that recognized that unit-level leader development programs were inadequate.

Their article proposed "a general framework for designing unit-level leader development programs that linked formal and informal instruction with job-related experiences."¹⁸ They focused primarily on the battalion commander's leader development responsibilities for the officers in the unit.

The framework they developed is focused around six questions. The questions focus on both the individual and the position that he or she fills. The questions include:

- Who gets developed?
- What are the developmental goals?
- What is the state of development?
- What are the developmental objectives?
- How do I assess progress?
- What strategies can I use?¹⁹

The key component of the author's framework is that "subordinate leaders, even when occupying similar organizational positions, are different, and thus require different kinds of programs tailored to their needs."²⁰ This

statement recognizes that the desired level of leadership development cannot be attained by the weekly battalion-level officer professional development class.

Each subordinate leader must be assessed as to their individual level of development in their current position and for positions they may fill in the future. A review of the Officer Record Brief (ORB), personal interviews, and observed performance all serve as tools for assessment.

The authors offer several strategies for reaching development goals. Group instruction is an effective technique for "achieving objectives focused on understanding or analyzing broad issues, or for objectives associated with attitudes and values."²¹ Officers' call, tactical exercises without troops, staff rides, and seminars are all examples of commonly used group instruction.

Formal instruction may also be accomplished in alternative ways. Examples are one-on-one coaching and teaching through example. Officers may also enroll in correspondence courses, or attend local or temporary duty Army schools. The Combined Arms and Services Staff School (CAS3) is an example. The key is to link each method with a specific goal.

To be effective leaders officers must provide subordinates with feedback. "We must encourage those behaviors that we want Our feedback must be

systematic and deliberate, explaining specifically what worked and what did not."²²

Mark Littel gives a more recent example of a leader development program in his article "Leader Development in the 1990s: One Way to Success." He describes a battalion-level program that applies to both the NCOs and officers in the unit. This program has several components (Table 1)²³ with specific allocations of time and resources given to each.

The reading program uses lists provided in MQS manuals and other material related to the unit's METL. The battalion publishes approved reading lists, and officers are required to submit book reviews through the chain of command for evaluation and feedback.

Table 1
Leader Development Program Components
Source: "Leader Development in the 1990s"

<u>Component</u>	<u>Percentage</u>
Certification.	25
OPD Classes.	20
Counselling.	15
MQS.	15
Weapons Qualification. . .	10
Reading Program.	9
Physical Fitness	5
Unit Reception	1

Professional development classes "must focus on tactically and technically relevant hands-on training."²⁴ Classes must be approved by the battalion commander, well prepared, and relate directly to the unit METL. Classes should involve the entire group and involve questions and discussion.

The certification program is used to evaluate the technical and tactical level of competence in leaders. The certification program described by Littel consists of three components: "Prerequisites prescribed by the commander, a certification ride, and an awards ceremony."²⁵

Mark Rocke and Thomas Hayden emphasize the importance of counseling to leader development in their article "Officer Development: A Doctrinal Imperative." They present an argument that there are shortcomings in the current commander-subordinate interaction due to:

- Poor initial counseling
- Improper use of the support form
- Lack of performance counseling programs
- Lack of periodic feedback
- Failure to develop a mutual understanding
- Lack of counseling on evaluation reports²⁶

Rocke and Hayden propose a framework for enhancing leader development through a structured counseling program. Their program describes communication and feedback conducted in six forms:

- Communicate expectations
- Conduct support form counseling
- Conduct self-development counseling
- Conduct periodic counseling
- Conduct end-of-rating-period support form counseling
- Conduct end-of rating-period counseling²⁷

This program provides an excellent framework for feedback in a leader development program. First, it would force commanders to articulate standards and leadership philosophy. Secondly, it would assist in establishing relationships between commanders and subordinate officers quickly. Third, it would set an example for officers to emulate in their own counseling and leader development programs. Finally, it would develop and reinforce a healthy command climate.²⁸

The Command and General Staff College (CGSC) at Fort Leavenworth, Kansas, uses several articles from military publications and examples of leader development programs in their training curriculum. These examples focus on leadership by example, certification programs, and two specific battalion-level leadership development programs.

In one article used by CGSC, "The Omega Force," James D. McConnell, Jr., pursues the concept of "lead by example" as practiced in his battalion at Fort Richardson, Alaska. The "Omega Force" was developed and implemented by the battalion commander William C. Ohl III to train officers and develop leadership skills within the battalion.

The key to the Omega Force was a quarterly platoon mission in which the battalion commander demonstrated leadership to subordinate officers by acting as the platoon leader for the Omega Force platoon. The platoon consisted of all officers assigned to the battalion. Each officer was assigned duties for that particular mission within the normal light infantry platoon organization. Table 2 provides an example of duty positions assigned in the "Omega Force."²⁹

Table 2
Omega Force Duty Positions
Source: "The Omega Force"

<u>Duty Position</u>	<u>Assigned Position</u>
Commander.	Platoon Leader
Executive Officer.	Platoon Sergeant
Communications Officer	Radio Telephone Operator
Battalion Surgeon.	Medic
Fire Support Officer	Platoon Forward Observer
Company Commanders	M60 Gunners and Crew 90mm Gunners and Crew
Platoon Leaders/Assistant. . .	Squad Leaders and Staff Officers Rifleman

Officers learned from observing the battalion commander and other officers doing their jobs. Each officer also learned the hardships of particular duty positions that the individual soldier is required to endure. A side benefit stemming from the Omega Force exercises was cohesion within the officers of the unit.

The Omega Force demonstrates the initiative that can be demonstrated in advancing leader development activities. Although this technique is resource and time intensive its effectiveness is without question.

In another article used by CGSC, "Subaltern Stakes: Growing Lieutenants in the 3d Armored Cavalry Regiment," James M. Lyle and N. Winn Noyes describe the leader development program within the 3d Armored Cavalry Regiment at Fort Bliss, El Paso. The major component of this program is a certification program where junior officers are trained.

The certification progresses in three distinct phases. Phase I begins when the officer is notified of his assignment to the unit. This phase of the program is essentially a sponsorship program where the officer is mailed a welcome packet. The welcome packet emphasizes that the officer is joining an elite unit and that high standard of performance will be expected.

Phase II is initiated when the officers reports to the unit. The officer is required to report in accordance with a tradition that "is based on 140 years of mounted warrior tradition."³⁰ The officer is then briefed by key members of the unit to insure the officer is properly oriented to the unit's mission and functions.

Phase III is the actual certification process. "His troop commander becomes his mentor with the specific

responsibility to ensure he is soldierized, officerized, and baptized in the spirit of blood and steel."³¹

The soldierizing process insures that the officer is proficient in the basic skills required of an officer in the unit. Tasks include the Army Physical Fitness Test, weapons qualification, preventive maintenance checks and services on organic vehicles and weapons systems, and vehicle licensing. The officer must also demonstrate proficiency in a number of common military tasks and tasks specific to his specific duty assignment.

Officerizing ensures the officer is capable of completing the administrative duties required of officers in the unit. These duties include precombat inspections, counselling, Enlisted Evaluation Reports, and reports of survey. A reading list is also provided to the officer.

Baptism in the spirit of blood and steel requires the officer to demonstrate proficiency in the art of war. Each officer is evaluated under stress and conditions of combat. Tasks include crew qualification and platoon live fire exercises. He must also demonstrate familiarity with the unit's war plan and standard operating procedures.

At the conclusion of the certification process qualified officers are recognized at special ceremonies. This process builds confidence in junior officers and their ability to quickly integrate into the unit. It also gives

subordinates confidence that their leader is qualified to lead them in combat.

Another example of officer leader development used by CGSC is taken from the officer leader development program of the 6th Battalion, 6th Infantry, commanded by Lieutenant Colonel Michael L. McGee. In addition to many of the concepts discussed previously, his program includes peer and subordinate ratings, and personality and fitness assessments.

Peer and subordinate ratings are conducted semi-annually within the unit. They are conducted to insure that leaders are provided feedback from their peers and subordinates. Although the intent is designed to provide feedback in a nonthreatening way, each officer is required to attach the results of subordinate ratings to the DA Form 67-8-1. This form is used to provide the officer's rater with comments on duty performance during the rating period.

Summary

In summary, many sources are available for information on many of the aspects of leader development. These sources range from doctrinal literature to military publications. Many of the sources provide actual working programs within units and give examples of techniques for executing leader development doctrine.

CHAPTER 3

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The purpose of this chapter is to describe the methodology used to conduct this study. The chapter also presents a proposed model for battalion-level officer leader development.

Methodology

The methodology used to conduct the research was three phased. The initial phase consisted of the collection of facts derived from a search of the available literature. The second phase consisted of making a model for battalion-level officer leader development and applying the model. The third phase consisted of a survey based on the model to officers enrolled in the US Army Command and General Staff College Pre-Command Course (PCC). Finally, the products of all three phases of the methodology support conclusions that answer the research questions.

The collection of evidence exploited several sources. Those sources were published doctrinal material, material from professional military journals pertaining to the subject, and published and unpublished studies. Finally, the

application of the model and a survey instrument completed the collection of evidence.

The first phase of this research project was concerned with a review of all relevant literature related to officer leader development. The purpose of this phase of the study was to determine the doctrinal basis for officer leader development and to survey the available published and unpublished literature on the subject. This phase of the study focused on answering the research questions and is addressed in chapter two.

Phase two involved making a model for battalion-level officer leader development and applying the model using leader development vignettes. Biographies were developed to depict officers within an Army battalion. These officers were selected from various positions within the unit to depict a wide range of rank, experience, and training levels. The model is then applied to each officer to demonstrate the specifics of how the model is designed to operate. The model and its application is presented in chapter three.

During phase three the model was evaluated by Pre-Command Course (PCC) students using a survey instrument. These students are majors, lieutenant colonels, and colonels that have been selected for battalion or brigade-level commands. The comments and suggestions from these officers were carefully considered and either incorporated into the final model or highlighted in the thesis assessment chapter.

Finally, chapter four presents an analysis and discussion of the evidence. Chapter five of this thesis presents the conclusions of the research with recommendations for further study.

Proposed Battalion-Level Officer Leader Development Model

This model provides a descriptive methodology for an approach to officer leader development at the battalion level. It is designed to be applicable to combat arms, combat support, and combat service support battalions throughout the active and reserve component Army. The model is based on the Army's Military Qualification Standards (MQS) system and the three pillars of leader development described in DA PAM 600-32: institutional training, operational assignments, and self-development.

The commander plays a critical role in the development of the unit's officers. He must ensure the unit's officer leader development program meets the needs of both the organization and its officers. To do so, he must take advantage of opportunities for the leader and the unit through:

- Unit leader development training, which includes varied assignments and METL-based training.
- Institutional training
- Structured self-development

The commander develops the unit's program in accordance with the higher commander's guidance and with the assistance of subordinate leaders. To be most effective, the commander must continually listen to, understand, and mentor junior officers. He must ensure that the program focuses on development, not evaluation, and that the program establishes a climate that encourages personal and professional growth. He must also build and maintain an environment of trust and confidence that permeates the organization.

The leader development program must be an integral part of the unit training program. No longer can leader development consist solely of the weekly battalion or company-level professional development class. Leader development must be included in all activities within the unit. It must also be battle focused and support the training of those skills demanded by both the unit's METL and the professional development needs of officers within the unit.

The leader development program must be implemented at the lowest level possible, with leadership, support, and involvement at the highest levels. All leaders must be personally involved with developing subordinate officers. The battalion commander develops company commanders and other officers he rates; company commanders develop platoon leaders and executive officers; the battalion executive officer develops primary staff officers; and primary staff officers develop their subordinate officers.

An effective leader development program will result in trained and motivated officers, capable of performing their duties to a high standard and prepared to assume future positions of greater responsibility. The unit will also benefit with increased performance, unit esprit, discipline, trust in leadership, and a strong command climate.

This model is organized into five components: unit training, operational assignments, institutional training, self-development, and professional development. MQS, as the Army's system for leader development, serves as the foundation for all development. Leader development occurs in the three phases described in FM 25-101, Training the Force, to ensure officers develop in a progressive and sequential manner. And finally, the assessment and feedback process provides a continual flow of developmental feedback to individuals. Figure 2 provides a graphical presentation of the Battalion-Level Officer Leader Development Model. MQS is the Army's leader development system for officers and is the basis for this leader development model. It identifies the skills and proficiencies an officer must master to reach expected performance levels. Commanders are required to provide training on those MQS tasks which support their unit METL.

MQS II addresses development for company grade officers from commissioning until promotion to major or attendance at command and staff college level schooling. The

MQS II common task manual documents the common requirements of this program while branch manuals lay out the specific requirements of each branch. It also requires company grade officers to complete required schools, key branch developmental assignments, and a reading program.




Figure 2. Proposed Battalion-Level Officer Leader Development Model.

Military Qualification Standards (MQS) System

MQS III addresses leader development for majors and lieutenant colonels. Unlike MQS II, this program is not a task based program. It describes the areas of knowledge with which field grade officers must be conversant. It also

places a much greater emphasis on self-development than MQS II.

Unit commanders are most directly involved with MQS II. They should select and train MQS II common and branch specific tasks that reflect their unit's training plan and METL. Unit commanders are not required to train officers on MQS tasks that do not support their METL. MQS II and III also support the units' leader development program with common and branch specific reading programs.

Leader Development Phases

Leader development for individual officers occurs in three phases. The Reception and Integration Phase is designed to incorporate new officers into the battalion. The Basic Skills Development Phase is designed to ensure that new leaders attain a minimum acceptable level of proficiency in the critical tasks necessary to perform their mission. Finally, the Advanced Development and Sustainment Phase involves sustaining those tasks already mastered and developing proficiency in new tasks.

The Reception and Integration Phase begins when the unit is notified that an officer is assigned to the unit. The commander should assign an officer to sponsor the incoming officer. The sponsor then has the responsibility to establish communications with the incoming officer. The sponsor also provides information and assistance to ensure

that the incoming officer experiences a smooth transition into the unit.

The battalion commander should interview the officer upon arrival in the unit to assess, assign, and describe individual standards and expectations. During this interview the commander should review the Officer Record Brief (ORB), discuss previous experience, training, personal desires, duty assignment, and possible future assignments.

After interviews with the chain of command, the officer receives a unit orientation. It should include introductions to and briefings by the unit's key personnel to teach the unit's history, traditions, and mission. This phase is critical to ensuring that a climate of trust and confidence is established between the commander and the new officer.

The Basic Skills Development Phase brings the leader to a minimum acceptable level of proficiency in critical tasks. Commanders must identify the basic skills that are required for all officers in the unit and for specific duty positions. Certification is a technique for verifying that officers have mastered these basic skills.

Certification programs are designed to ensure that officers become proficient in basic soldier and officer skills and that officers are capable of performing critical wartime missions. The program must be consistent with the unit organization, mission, doctrine, and branch of the

individual officer. The program can serve as a rite of passage for an officer; and once an officer completes the certification process, he should be recognized in an appropriate ceremony.

During certification, officers must first demonstrate proficiency in the basic skills required of every soldier in the unit. Examples include:

- Qualify with individual weapon.
- Demonstrate proficiency in Common Tasks (CTT).
- Pass the Army Physical Fitness Test (APFT).
- Perform preventative maintenance checks and services (PMCS) on unit equipment.
- Obtain operator's license for all assigned vehicles.

Officers must also demonstrate proficiency in those basic abilities required of all officers in the unit. The MQS manual of common tasks provides the necessary references for an officer to attain proficiency in basic officer skills. Examples of basic officer skills include:

- Inspect soldiers and equipment.
- Supervise maintenance of equipment.
- Counsel subordinates.
- Write an Enlisted Evaluation Report (EER).
- Act as Unit Duty Officer.
- Demonstrate proficiency in unit training management.
- Conduct unit drill and ceremonies.
- Inspect maintenance forms and records
- Conduct a report of survey.

Finally, officers must demonstrate proficiency in the unit's METL tasks and wartime mission. They must also demonstrate proficiency in the branch specific tasks necessary for successful mission accomplishment. The unit's METL, Mission Training Plans (MTP), battle books, war plans,

standard operating procedures (SOPs), and the officers' branch MQS manual provide the necessary reference information to certify officers. Unit ARTEPs, live fire exercises, gunnery exercises, logistics exercises, and command post exercises provide events to assess proficiency in critical unit mission tasks.

The successful completion of a certification program does not mark the end of leader development for officers. They should transition into the Advanced Development and Sustainment Phase. This phase sustains basic skills, trains the leaders to a higher level of proficiency in critical tasks, and continually challenges them to attain a higher level of individual development. Examples include:

- Additional duty assignments.
- Special Projects.
- Observer Controller during tactical exercises.
- Teach Officer/NCO Professional Development classes.
- Teach another officer to perform a skill or task.

Assessment, Feedback, and Counseling

Leadership assessment, feedback, and counseling are the most important elements of a leader development program. This process allows commanders to communicate expectations, assess leadership performance, and provide feedback to individual officers. The process is critical for establishing a relationship of trust and confidence between commanders and subordinate officers. To be most effective this process must be incorporated into all leader activities.

Assessment, feedback, and counseling must be institutionalized within the unit. Leaders should assess the performance of their subordinates at every available opportunity. These assessments should be a nonthreatening, unbiased, uninflated, and objective determination of an officer's performance on a leader task. FM 22-100 describes the following steps for an effective assessment of a leaders performance:

- Decide what leadership skill, knowledge, or attitude you want to assess.
- Make a plan to observe the leadership performance.
- Observe the leadership performance and record your observations.
- Compare the leadership performance you observed to a standard.
- Decide if the leadership performance you observed exceeds, meets, or falls below the standard.

Based on this assessment, feedback can be provided to individual officers by their leaders. Feedback involves an informal communication of an assessment to the individual officer. It focuses on the individual event or task and is formative in nature. To be most effective the feedback should be provided much like an AAR, with the individual officer identifying his own strengths and weaknesses. It should be provided as soon after the event as possible and can be conducted anywhere: the field, motor pool, or office. Since the feedback is informal, no written record is needed. Finally, it should result in an informal action plan to improve leader performance on that specific task.

Officers must also be counseled periodically.

Counseling should provide a formal evaluation and summary of the officers performance during the period in question. Like feedback, counseling will result in an action plan to correct any performance deficiencies. Unlike feedback, a written record will often be used. Officers should receive initial counseling, periodic counseling, and end-of-the-rating-period counseling.

During initial counseling leaders must communicate expectations and standards. This also includes conducting initial Officer Evaluation Report (OER) Support Form counseling to establish specific job requirements and performance goals.

Periodic counseling focuses on performance feedback and evaluation. These sessions should occur every thirty to ninety days. Performance counseling should focus on the individuals OER Support Form, and upon the completion of the counseling, subordinates should know how their commanders evaluate their overall performance. A formal action plan should be developed to correct any areas needing improvement.

Self-Development counseling focuses on the individual officer's self-assessment. This process helps the commander to understand the subordinate's unique developmental needs. It also helps to gain support for developmental activities that will occur outside the unit environment.

Finally, end-of-rating-period counseling helps the officer to complete the Significant Contributions portion of the OER Support Form. This allows a frank discussion of the specific highlights of the officers performance during the rating period without focusing on any evaluation. Upon completion of the Support Form, a subsequent session is scheduled to counsel the officer on his overall performance during the rating period.

Assessment, feedback, and counseling are critical to developing trust and confidence between officers. They must be assessed and provided with feedback often. When this is done counseling will not be viewed as threatening or negative and subordinates will not be surprised by their evaluations.

Assignments

Assignments are also critical to the development of officers. The commander uses assignments to provide officers with the experience required for professional and personal development.

The assignment pattern established by the commander should support specific unit requirements and the branch requirements outlined in DA PAM 600-3, Commissioned Officer Development and Career Management. Assignments must also provide progressive development for the officer. Finally, the time an officer spends in a specific assignment should be dependent on performance, not time.

Unit Training

Unit training provides excellent opportunities for commanders to assess, teach, coach, and provide feedback to officers. These events develop officers to perform duty specific tasks, their individual officer branch tasks, and increase the overall level of performance of the unit. Army Mission Training Plans (MTP) and MQS branch manuals provide specific leader tasks that can be evaluated during training.

Examples of leader development opportunities include:

- Tactical Exercise Without Troops (TEWT)
- Command Post Exercises (CPX)
- Situational Training Exercises (STX)
- Field Training Exercises (FTX)
- Combat Training Centers (CTC)
- Gunnery Exercises
- Battle Command Training Program (BCTP)
- Emergency Deployment Readiness Exercises (EDRE)
- Logistical Exercises (LOGEX)
- Battalion and Company-level Seminars or Classes

Professional Development

The Professional Development component is designed to expand the knowledge and modify the attitudes of all officers in the unit. Activities must be designed to explore the historical and traditional views of warfare. They must be exposed to new concepts, doctrine, and force development. They must understand unit administration, military justice, maintenance management, investigations, and reports of surveys. They must also be forced to examine their ethics and values against a standard. Finally, officers must participate in professional reading and writing programs that

meet the requirements of each individual officer's MQS program and the needs of the unit. Other professional development activities include:

- Guest Speakers
- Professional Societies
- Staff Rides
- Community Activities
- Battle Analysis
- Films
- Battlefield or Memorial Visits

Self-Development

Each individual officer has responsibility for self-development. Programs can consist of individual and group study, research, professional reading, practice, and self-assessment. Continuing civilian education and involvement in civilian community or professional organizations can also provide unique leader development opportunities. MQS provides an excellent guide for structuring self-development programs. Commanders assist an officer's self-development by providing support, advice, and counseling.

Peer and subordinates can provide valuable feedback to the individual officer. Peer and subordinate feedback should be designed to provide specific feedback that is useful in the developmental process. This feedback should be provided directly to the officer and not be filtered by the chain of command.

Institutional Training

Institutional training encompasses all of the formal and informal instructional training and education leaders receive while attending Army schools. It is a foundation on which unit commanders can build, mold, and shape leaders and on which the developing leaders can base their self-development. The officer's institutional training is anchored on the officer basic course, officer advanced course, the Combined Arms and Services Staff School, completion of a command and staff college, and, for selected officers, completion of a senior service college.

Commanders must be aware of and take advantage of opportunities to send their leaders to all appropriate technical, developmental, skill qualification, and confidence building courses that are available through the Army school system. Commanders can also assist their officers in remaining knowledgeable of and competitive for institutional training selection by teaching, coaching, and mentoring them. This formal training is a key part of the unit commander's leader development program, which benefits both the unit and the individual officer.

CHAPTER 4

APPLICATION OF THE MODEL

This chapter uses notional officers of the 2/23 Infantry Battalion at Fort Leavenworth, Kansas, to demonstrate an application of selected concepts described in the Proposed Battalion-Level Officer Leader Development Model.

2/23 Infantry Battalion

The battalion is commanded by LTC Jones. He has commanded the unit for over one year, and his battalion is considered by many as the best in the division. He credits much of the unit's success to its Leader Development Program. His program for officer leader development follows the Proposed Officer Leader Development Model described earlier and is reinforced by his personal command involvement.

His personal philosophy is that the development of leaders is key to the success of the unit. After beginning the program early in his command he took several opportunities to explain the program to the battalion's officers. He has also set a personal example by the actions he has taken to personally develop those leaders he supervises.

Every training event the battalion conducts has leader development as one of its goals. Subordinate commanders are required to address leader development during quarterly training briefings and the battalion's weekly training meeting. In the 2/23 Infantry, leader development is considered a "way of life."

Table 3
Leader Development Vignettes

<u>Officer</u>	<u>Position</u>	<u>Application</u>
MAJ Smith	Battalion S-3	Reception and Integration Phase Basic Skills Development Phase Assessment and Feedback
2LT Hope	Platoon Leader	Reception and Integration Phase Basic Skills Development Phase Certification Assessment and Feedback
CPT Boyd	Battalion S-2	Basic Skills Development Phase Unit Training Assessment and Feedback
CPT Davis	Battalion S-4	Unit Training Self-Development Institutional Training Operational Assignments Assessment and Feedback
CPT Walker	HHC Commander	Advanced Development and Sustainment Self-Development Assessment and Feedback
1LT Jones	Scout Platoon Leader	Advanced Skills Phase Operational Assignments Assessment and Feedback
All		Professional Development

Leader Development Vignettes

The following individual officer leader development vignettes represent an application of the Proposed Battalion-level Officer Leader Development Model. Each officer demonstrates a selected component of the model. Table 3 identifies each officer, duty position, and component of the model that is applied.

Battalion Operations Officer (S-3)--MAJ David E. Smith

MAJ Smith assumed his duties as the Battalion S-3 following his attendance at the Command and General Staff College and a one-year assignment as the Division Secretary of the General Staff (SGS). He assumed his duties as the S-3 only two weeks ago. A summary of his Officer Record Brief (ORB) is provided in table 4.

MAJ Smith is a highly qualified officer with over thirteen years of active duty experience. His experiences at Fort Hood and in Germany give him significant experience in mechanized infantry tactics. He, however, is concerned about his ability to perform as the S-3 due to his lack of experience with the recently fielded M-2, Bradley Fighting Vehicle. This is also his first opportunity to serve in an Operations and Training assignment.

MAJ Smith is a unique officer, in that he is one of only two field grade officers in the battalion. He has already demonstrated those skills necessary for an infantry

LT and CPT during his previous assignments. He must, however, sustain these skills and in one particular case, the M-2, he must learn entirely new skills. He must also demonstrate those skills necessary for an infantry MAJ and prepare for future levels of responsibility at the LTC and higher level.

Table 4
Officer Record Brief Summary--MAJ Smith

Civilian Education

BA Virginia Military Institute Graduate-1979

MPA University of Arizona-1991

Military Education

Airborne-1978

Infantry Officer Basic Course-1979

Ranger Course-1979

Infantry Officer Advanced Course-1982

Combined Arms Service Staff School-1983

Command and General Staff College-1991

<u>Months</u>	<u>Organization</u>	<u>Station</u>	<u>Duty Title</u>
14	2/7 IN MECH	FT HOOD TX	PLATOON LEADER
12	2/7 IN MECH	FT HOOD TX	CO EXECUTIVE OFFICER
12	2/7 IN MECH	FT HOOD TX	BN S-1
14	1/18 IN MECH	BAMBERG FRG	BN S-4
19	1/18 IN MECH	BAMBERG FRG	COMPANY COMMANDER
12	3 ID MECH	BAMBERG FRG	AIDE DE CAMP
36	U. ARIZONA	ARIZONA	ASST PROF OF MIL SCIENCE
12	52D DIV MECH	FT LEAV KS	SGS
01	2/23 IN MECH	FT LEAV KS	BN S-3

MAJ Smith is currently in the Reception and Integration phase of the battalion's leader development program. During his initial counseling with his battalion commander they reviewed his Officer Record Brief (ORB) and

discussed his previous assignments and experience. The commander identified his lack of experience with the M-2 and stated that they would discuss a plan to correct the deficiency at a subsequent meeting.

During the initial counseling they discussed his personal and professional goals and how this job as the S-3 related to his career and possible future assignments. They also discussed his OER Support Form and decided that he would prepare a draft that they could discuss later. At the conclusion of the meeting the commander directed him to get on the brigade commanders calender to receive his initial interview.

During the Reception and Integration Phase MAJ Smith followed the battalion checklist of integration tasks for field grade officers. These activities were designed to familiarize him with the activities and key leaders and give him an opportunity to assess the status of the unit. The activities included:

- Office calls with the Battalion XO, Command Sergeant Major, and Company Commanders.
- Office call with the Brigade S-3.
- Information briefings by the battalion staff sections.

After a short time to get situated in the unit the commander met with MAJ Smith to discuss a plan for his individual leader development during the Basic Skills Development Phase. The commander was primarily concerned with his lack of experience with the M-2 and they determined

a specific action plan to insure that he attained proficiency. The commander also referred to ARTEP 71-2 (MTP), The Tank and Mechanized Infantry Task Force, to identify the other skills critical for the Battalion S-3. They reviewed the battalion training calender to determine an action plan for when these tasks could be trained.

B/1 Platoon Leader--2LT John C. Hope

2LT Hope arrived in the battalion one month ago from the Infantry Officer Basic Course. During the Reception and Integration Phase of the battalion's Leader Development Program the Battalion Commander interviewed him and assigned him to D Company. A summary of his ORB is provided in table 5.

Table 5
ORB Summary-2LT Hope

Civilian Education
BS University of Maryland-1991

Military Education
Infantry Officer Basic Course-1991
Airborne-1992
Bradley Commander Course-1991

<u>Months</u>	<u>Organization</u>	<u>Station</u>	<u>Duty Title</u>
01	D 2/23 IN MECH	FORT LEAV KS	PLATOON LEADER

LT Hope is a unique officer within the battalion because he is a newly assigned 2LT with no previous

experience within any Army unit. He does have, however, a wealth of training that he gained through ROTC and his Infantry Officer Basic Course.

LT Hope's company commander, CPT Willis, conducted an Initial Counseling session with him to conduct an initial assessment and provide him with an overview of the company. CPT Willis explained that LT Hope would not be assigned to his platoon until he completed the minimum required integration tasks required by the Battalion Leader Development Program. Those tasks included:

- Receive individual equipment.
- Orientation by battalion staff.
- Orientation by the Company XO, First Sergeant, supply Sergeant, Armorer, Motor Sergeant, NBC Specialist, Communications Sergeant, and Training NCO.

During the week that it took for him to complete the integration requirements the Company Commander spent time to prepare LT Hope to assume his duties as a platoon leader. Their activities included reviewing the company METL, tactical SOPs, the unit training plan, and the standards he expected of his platoon leaders. CPT Willis felt that this extra week allowed him to develop a strong relationship of trust and confidence between them that would payoff later.

At the completion of the week, CPT Willis assigned LT Hope to a platoon and introduced him to his Platoon Sergeant. CPT Willis counseled both individuals on his expectations and reminded them of the responsibilities that each had for leading the platoon. Finally, he directed LT Hope to prepare

a draft OER Support Form to facilitate counseling later in the week.

At the conclusion of the Reception and Integration Phase LT Hope began the Basic Skills Development Phase of leader development. The battalion's Certification Program provided the primary means for developing junior officers in the battalion during this phase. CPT Willis counseled him on his responsibilities for certification during Periodic Counseling and emphasized the importance of this program to his development.

During the execution of the Certification Program CPT Willis took several opportunities to assess LT Hope's performance. One task that he assessed was Supervise Preventative Maintenance Checks and Services (PMCS). The Certification Program referred to the MQS II, Manual of Common Tasks, for the standard. Following the platoon PMCS period CPT Willis gave LT Hope feedback concerning his performance. He conducted the feedback session much like a leadership after action review, with LT Hope describing his actions in supervising the platoon.

Battalion Intelligence Officer (S2)-1LT Boyd

1LT Boyd assumed his duties as the Battalion Intelligence Officer (S-2) following one year as a Ground Surveillance Radar (GSR) Platoon Leader in the Division Military Intelligence Battalion and six months as the

battalion's Battlefield Intelligence Control Center Officer (BICC). He assumed duties as the Battalion S-2 when his predecessor departed for the Military Intelligence (MI) Advanced Course. He completed the battalion's Certification Program during his tenure as the BICC. LT Boyd's ORB summary is provided in Table 6.

Table 6
ORB Summary--1LT Boyd

Civilian Education

U.S. Military Academy-1989

Military Education

Military Intelligence Officer Basic Course-1989

<u>Months</u>	<u>Organization</u>	<u>Station</u>	<u>Duty Title</u>
12	102 MI BN	FT LEAV KS	GSR PLATOON LEADER
06	2/23 IN MECH	FT LEAV KS	BICC
02	2/23 IN MECH	FT LEAV KS	BN S-2

LT Boyd is a unique officer because he is the only Military Intelligence (MI) officer within the battalion. His rater, the battalion XO, is not familiar with the training that he received at the MI Basic Course. He is also not familiar with the MI Branch MQS Manual tasks that LT Boyd is required to master.

LT Boyd's rater is the Battalion Executive Officer (XO). He met with the XO recently for periodic counseling. During the counseling session the XO discussed the Basic Skills Development Phase of leader development. The primary

issue discussed involved training LT Boyd to attain a high level of proficiency as the S-2 prior to the upcoming NTC rotation. They referred to ARTEP 71-2 (MTP), The Tank and Mechanized Infantry Task Force, and the Military Intelligence Branch MQS manual for specific tasks to be included in an action plan.

The first opportunity for the XO to assess LT Boyd would be during the battalion CPX scheduled for the next week. Before the battalion CPX the XO prepared a plan to observe LT Boyd performing his duties as the S-2. He referred to the action plan developed earlier to determine the specific tasks and standards that he would use for assessment. During the battalion's CPX the XO observed LT Boyd and made written and mental notes on his performance. He also used many opportunities to provide feedback and personally teach and coach him during the exercise.

Following the CPX the XO called LT Boyd to his office for periodic counseling. He used the opportunity to provide feedback on the specific tasks that he observed during the CPX. The counseling session was a two-way conversation, with both providing valuable input. The session resulted in a plan to retrain those tasks needing improvement.

This process served two purposes. First, it identified critical tasks necessary for LT Boyd's performance as the S-2 and initiated the process of training those to a high standard. Second, it helped to establish an environment

of trust and confidence between LT Boyd and his rater through teaching, coaching, assessment and constructive feedback.

Battalion Supply Officer (S-4)--CPT Steven P. Davis

CPT Davis assumed his duties as the Battalion S-4 following his attendance at the Infantry Officer Advanced Course (IOAC). Prior to commissioning through OCS, he served for three years as an enlisted infantryman in the 83d Airborne Division. CPT Davis has over six years of experience in light infantry including combat duty with the Rangers in Panama. Despite wanting to return to a light infantry unit after IOAC, he was assigned to the 2/23 Infantry, a mechanized infantry unit. A summary of his ORB is provided at Table 7.

CPT Davis is currently near to attaining proficiency in all of the tasks required in the Basic Skills Development phase of the battalion's Leader Development Program. During his assignment as the S-4 the Battalion XO, his rater, focused on the Unit Training component of the battalion's program to prepare CPT Davis for his next assignment, company command.

For this training the XO and CPT Davis jointly prepared an action plan to prepare him for command. They determined several activities that he could participate in to prepare him for command. This activities included:

- Officer in Charge (OIC) of Bradley Gunnery Range.
- Lane evaluator for platoon-level tactical lane training.
- Assistant evaluator for company-level tactical lane training.
- Participation in the battalion's Bradley Gunnery Skills Test (BGST) to maintain proficiency in Bradley skills that he learned in the Bradley Commanders Course.

Table 7
ORB Summary-CPT Davis

Civilian Education
BA Sam Houston State University

Military Education
Airborne-1983
Officer Candidate School-1986
Infantry Officer Basic Course-1986
Ranger-1987
Pathfinder-1989
Infantry Officer Advanced Course-1990
Bradley Commander Course-1991

<u>Months</u>	<u>Organization</u>	<u>Station</u>	<u>Duty Title</u>
12	1/17 IN LIGHT	KOREA	PLATOON LEADER
18	1/75 IN RGR	FT LEWIS WA	PLATOON LEADER
12	1/75 IN RGR	FT LEWIS WA	SCOUT PLATOON LEADER
12	1/75 IN RGR	FT LEWIS WA	ASST S-3
10	2/23 IN MECH	FT RILEY KS	BN S-4

The XO also urged CPT Davis to use self-development as a tool to prepare for command. The XO recommended that he use the Infantry Branch MQS manual and the unit's METL as references to help guide his self-development. The XO also recommended several publications to supplement the MQS reading list that would help prepare him.

During CPT Davis' most recent Periodic Counseling the XO asked for a progress report on his CAS3 Phase One requirement. The XO emphasized that he was scheduled for an upcoming CAS3 class and must complete Phase One prior to attending the course. They agreed upon a schedule for completing the requirement and the XO asked to be kept informed of his progress.

Headquarters Company Commander (HHC)-CPT James Walker

CPT Walker assumed his duties as the Headquarters Company Commander following the successful command of another company within the battalion. He is currently the senior captain in the unit, and is considered by LTC Jones to be his best company commander. CPT Walker expects to leave the post in approximately nine months but his next duty assignment is unknown at this time. He wants to be a Small Group Instructor (SGI) in the Infantry School at Fort Benning, Georgia. A summary of his ORB is provided at Table 8.

CPT Walker is currently in the Advanced Development and Sustainment Phase of the battalion's Leader Development Program. The battalion commander is now focusing his efforts on exposing CPT Walker to the more advanced skills required of the HHC Commander.

The battalion commander's most recent Periodic Counseling session with CPT Walker focused on how he

intended to develop him during this phase. First, he wanted CPT Walker to expand his relationship with the Forward Support Battalion (FSB) Commander. The HHC METL required CPT Walker to operate his field trains within the Brigade Support Area (BSA), which is controlled by the FSB Commander. The action plan they developed required CPT Walker to coordinate with the FSB Commander to determine ways that he could assist in his development.

Table 8
ORB Summary--CPT Walker

Civilian Education

BS University of Florida

Military Education

Airborne-1983

Infantry Officer Basic Course-1985

Ranger-1985

Bradley Commander Course-1985

Infantry Officer Advanced Course-1989

Bradley Commander Course-1991

<u>Months</u>	<u>Organization</u>	<u>Station</u>	<u>Duty Title</u>
12	C 1/7 IN MECH	GERMANY	PLATOON LEADER
12	C 1/7 IN MECH	GERMANY	EXECUTIVE OFFICER
12	1/7 IN MECH	GERMANY	BN MAINTENANCE OFFICER
06	2/23 IN MECH	FT RILEY KS	S-1
12	B 2/23 IN MECH	FT RILEY KS	COMPANY COMMANDER
08	HHC 2/23 IN	FT RILEY KS	COMPANY COMMANDER

Secondly, LTC Jones tasked CPT Walker with writing an article for Infantry Magazine on some aspect of an Infantry HHC. This tasking served two purposes. First, it required

CPT Walker to conduct research on HHC tactics, techniques, and procedures. It also would give LTC Jones an opportunity to evaluate a written product.

Finally, LTC Jones counseled CPT Walker on his self-development. They reviewed the self-development plan that they jointly prepared earlier and discussed his progress in the program. CPT Walkers plan for self-development focused primarily on the requirements given in MQS II.

Scout Platoon Leader--1LT John S. Smith

1LT Smith assumed his duties as the Scout Platoon leader following eighteen months as a Bradley Platoon Leader. He is currently in the Advanced Development and Sustainment Phase of the battalion's Leader Development Program. A summary of his ORB is provided at Table 9.

Table 9
ORB Summary-1LT Smith

Civilian Education
Associate Degree 1988

Military Education
Officer Candidate School-1989
Infantry Officer Basic Course-1989
Airborne-1990
Ranger-1990

<u>Months</u>	<u>Organization</u>	<u>Station</u>	<u>Duty Title</u>
18	2/23 IN MECH	FT RILEY KS	Platoon Leader
10	2/23 IN MECH	FT RILEY KS	SCOUT PLATOON LEADER

During initial counseling several months earlier with his rater, CPT Walker, LT Smith voiced a desire to complete his undergraduate degree before attending the Advanced Course. CPT Walker agreed, and directed that LT Smith make obtaining a degree the first priority of his Self-Development Program. CPT Walker constantly expressed support and concern for his progress in the program and ensured that time was made available to attend the required classes.

Professional Development

The unit's professional development program is designed to educate officers in the art of war and prepare them for future leadership positions. The professional development program has two specific objectives for the quarter. First, activities must support leader training requirements for the upcoming NTC rotation. Secondly, activities must also support the Brigade Commanders Leader Development theme for the quarter, ethics.

Professional development responsibilities rotate between battalion-level and company or staff-level training. The S-3 has responsibility for battalion-level training, Company Commanders for company-level, and the Battalion XO for staff-level.

Battalion-level training focuses on critical battalion METL tasks that are critical to the battalions success. Company and Staff-level training focus on subordinate tasks

that support the battalion-level and are schedule to be trained prior to the battalion-level activity. The battalion level tasks included:

- Breach a Minefield
- Deliberate Attack
- Movement to Contact
- Defend

CHAPTER 4

ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION

This chapter analyzes and discusses the information gathered from several sources. First, it analyzes the results of the Leader Development Survey. Secondly, it provides a discussion of information gathered from an analysis of the FM 25-101 example leader development program, the proposed Battalion-Level Officer Leader Development Model and the leader development vignettes in chapter three.

The survey represents responses from officers attending the Pre-Command Course at Fort Leavenworth, Kansas. The survey was designed to assess the effectiveness of the proposed Battalion-Level Officer Leader Development Model described in chapter three, the Leader Development Program described in Appendix B of FM 25-101, and the overall views of the officers concerning leader development.

Of 32 officers asked to complete the survey, a total of 21 (66%) completed and returned the survey. Of the 21 respondents 17 (81%) agreed or strongly agreed that the proposed Officer Leader Development Model was a useful guide for officer leader development. This compares with 12 (57%) respondents stating that the current model described in FM 25-101 provides an adequate guide for unit commanders. Addition-

ally, 1 (5%) respondent disagreed that the model was adequate versus 7 (33%) respondents for the FM 25-101 model. Finally, 11 (52%) of the respondents agreed or strongly agreed that a Leader Development Training Circular focused at unit-level was needed.

The Army places a heavy burden upon the shoulders of its battalion-level commanders to develop officers. This requirement, while consistent with the requirement to train the unit to accomplish a wartime mission, requires an additional commitment of time and resources. Commanders, therefore, are reluctant to accept any requirement that does not contribute directly to the unit's METL.

All 21 (100%) respondents agreed or strongly agreed that officer leader development was important. Additionally, 18 (86%) agreed or strongly agreed that an effective officer leader development program can improve the unit's performance and command climate. Several officers, however, stated concerns about how much time that must be devoted to leader development.

The proposed Battalion Officer Leader Development Model identifies five critical pillars of unit-level leader development. These pillars are:

- Unit Training
- Professional Development
- Assignments
- Self-Development
- Institutional Training

Additionally, leader development is organized into phases to insure that it is progressive and sequential. MQS, as the Army's Officer Leader Development System provides a common reference for officers. Assessment, feedback, and counseling reinforces development. Finally, the commander is key in establishing and enforcing the program.

This model, while different from the FM 25-101 program and the process described in DA PAM 600-32, encompasses the key elements required for a successful program. It provides a clear link between each component and recognizes that leader development at the unit-level is fundamentally different than the Army's overall process. The following discussion describes these differences.

Leader Development Phases

The Proposed Leader Development Model application validates the phases of leader development found in FM 25-101. The phases include:

- A *reception and integration* phase for incorporating new leaders into the unit.
- A *basic skills development* phase that brings the leader to a minimum acceptable level of proficiency in critical tasks.
- An *advanced development and sustainment* phase that sustains basic skills, trains the leaders to a higher level of proficiency in critical tasks, and integrates the leader into the unit's continuing professional development program.¹

These phases delineate a progressive and sequential form of leader development that provide structure to unit

programs. The FM 25-101 model does provide an example of a leader development program and how these phases could be developed within each phase. The example highlights a 2LT's leader development throughout the three phases. It does not, however, attempt to address the development of officers that might enter the battalion as a CPT or MAJ. This gives the impression that leader development is only applicable to the most junior of officers.

The proposed model uses several examples to illustrate leader development during the three phases. These examples demonstrate some of the techniques that are available for a commander to use to develop officers of different rank and experience during each of the phases. Additionally, these illustrations also highlight some of the techniques available for developing officers of different rank and experience.

The FM 25-100 model does not discuss any requirement to validate proficiency in any of the basic skills. Certification is a technique currently in use in many units to formalize and validate a leaders proficiency in selected tasks. The officers surveyed responded that certification is an effective tool for developing officers. Many also plan to have certification programs in their new commands.

Certification, however, has a very negative connotation to many officers. Many see it as a training distractor and a program that can turn in an administrative nightmare. One officer commented in the survey that this is the type of

program that becomes centralized at a higher and hinder level. A battalion program soon becomes a brigade program, then a division program. That is already happening in some divisions.

Assessment, Feedback, and Counseling

Assessment and feedback is recognized as being critical to the development of leaders. Although this is recognized in doctrine, it does not receive much attention in the FM 25-101 model or example program. While the current OER system does have a requirement for counseling, many junior officers feel that they are not receiving adequate feedback and counseling. The 1992 JOLD Study identified that over 70 percent of junior officers felt that performance counseling and feedback was less than effective.²

The Proposed Model does integrate assessment, feedback, and counseling into the leader development process. The leader development vignettes use several examples to illustrate this concept. This process of assessing and providing feedback can easily be integrated into all unit activities. The process not only strengthens individual leaders, but develops trust and confidence between leaders.

MQS

MQS is a useful tool for leader development, however, many are not familiar with it. MQS is integrated into DA PAM

600-32 and FM 25-101, but only in respect to the self-development pillar of leader development. The Proposed Model explains the applicability of the MQS system and illustrates it in several examples through the leader development vignettes. The vignettes demonstrate that the key to MQS is understanding that it provides a common task and branch specific listing of tasks that are critical to the development of officers.

MQS can also be used as a developmental reference for commanders to select tasks that they want officers to train in. These tasks can also be selected to support the unit's METL. It is also helpful to commanders when they want to assess and provide feedback on specific tasks. Use of the MQS system not only helps in training officers for their current duty position, it is a useful tool for preparing officers for future assignments.

Self-Development

FM 25-101 places a heavy emphasis on self-development and requires officers to take responsibility for their own development. Although the FM 25-101 example program mentions MQS and reading programs as a tool for self-development, no link is made to how this happens. The proposed model uses several examples to illustrate how self-development can be integrated into a leader development program. The commander

must take part in this process to mentor and counsel officers regarding their self-development.

Institutional Training & Assignments

The proposed model and the FM 25-101 model are consistent regarding institutional training and assignments. The proposed model does explain and illustrate these two concepts in greater detail.

CHAPTER 6

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This chapter includes conclusions and recommendations drawn from the analysis and discussion presented in chapter 5. First, conclusions are made regarding the four research questions outlined in chapter 1. Secondly, recommendations are made concerning leader development doctrine. Finally, recommendations for future research are made concerning aspects of leader development that were beyond the scope of this study.

Conclusions

1. What is the current model for officer leader development? For the commander attempting to develop a unit-level officer leader development program, there are several key U.S. Army publications. The primary documents are DA PAM 600-32, FM 25-101, and the MQS series of manuals. DA PAM 600-32 provides an overview of the Army's doctrine for leader development. It describes officer leader development within the Army's three pillars of formal leader development. The pillars are Institutional Training, Operational Assignments, and Self-development.

Next, FM 25-101, establishes a model or example program for unit-level leader development. This model

identifies three phases of leader development and integrates the pillars as described in DA PAM 600-32. The phases are the Reception and Integration Phase, Basic Skills Development Phase, and the Advanced Development and Sustainment Phase.

Finally, the MQS series of manuals define the responsibilities that unit commanders have in implementing the MQS system. The MQS system provides the link between institutional training and operational assignments by identifying those tasks that are trained in the schoolhouse. It also helps a commander design a officer leader development program by providing tasks that can be linked to the unit's METL. Finally, MQS provides an excellent guide for an officer's self-development.

2. What are the strengths of the current model?

The primary strength of the current model is that it identifies phases for leader development. These phases provide a basis for unit-level programs and recognizes that development must be progressive and sequential. The current model also provides a brief example of a battalion-level leader development program. This example follows a newly assigned 2LT and SSG through their initial assignment to the unit and through the three phases of leader development. The example also addresses assignments, MQS, and professional reading programs for officers.

3. What are the weaknesses of the current model?

There are four weaknesses in the FM 25-101 model. First, it

does not integrate assessment, feedback, and counseling into the leader development program. Although this process for assessing a leader's performance and providing developmental feedback is briefly mentioned in DA PAM 600-32 and FM 25-101, it is not integrated into the example leader development program.

Secondly, the FM 25-101 model does not illustrate the unique challenges involved in developing officers of different rank or experience. The fact that the example uses a newly assigned 2LT could lead the reader to assume that higher ranking officers do not require a formal leader development program. 1LT's, CPT's, and MAJ's are not exempt from the requirement for leader development. The model also fails to illustrate leader development for Warrant Officers.

Next, the FM 25-101 example leader development program refers to certification programs, terrain rides, guest lectures and other professional development programs. It does not, however, give any further information or illustrate how these programs can be integrated into the leader development program.

Finally, MQS is not adequately discussed in the FM 25-101 example leader development program. The example given only refers to MQS as a self-development tool and does not give examples of how MQS is a tool for the commander. MQS is the Army's system for officer leader development and is designed to be used in each of the three pillars of leader

development. MQS is also not found in each of the three pillars of leader development in DA PAM 600-32.

4. What changes should be made to the current model?

The FM 25-101 example leader development program and associated leader development system is not broken. However, several improvements can be made. First, assessment, feedback, and counseling should be integrated into the model. Secondly, the MQS system should be explained in greater detail and more examples should be provided to describe its applicability to the officer leader development process. Next, examples of professional development programs should be provided. Finally, leader development examples should be provided to illustrate how CPT's and MAJ's are developed within a unit program.

Recommendations

1. The example leader development program can be deleted from FM 25-101 and a Leader Development Training Circular (TC) should be developed that provides a more in-depth examination and description of unit-level leader development. This TC should provide proven techniques and procedures provided from current commanders. At a minimum the TC should include descriptions and examples of the following:

- a. Phases of Leader Development
- b. MQS in each of the three pillars of leader development

- c. Professional Development Programs
- d. Examples including LT, CPT, and MAJ
- e. Assessment, Feedback, and Counseling
- f. Assignments
- g. Self-Development
- h. Institutional Training
- i. Publications that support leader development
- 2. MQS must be integrated into the Institutional Training and Operational Assignment Pillars of DA PAM 600-32.

Recommendations for Future Research

1. Examine current leader development programs to determine what is currently working for unit commanders. The study should include combat, combat support, and combat service support units in the active and reserve component.

2. Evaluate the current utility of MQS in units. Are commanders and officers familiar with the requirements of MQS? Is it currently being used as a leader development tool for officers?

3. Examine the utility of peer and subordinate ratings in leader development programs. Can example techniques be developed for conducting these ratings?

4. Evaluate the leader development instruction that is being conducted in the officer basic courses, officer advanced courses, the command and staff college, Pre-Command Course, and Army War College. Is the instruction consistent with Army leader development doctrine? Do officers understand the role of MQS?

ENDNOTES

Chapter 1

¹US Army, FM 22-100, Military Leadership. (Washington D.C.: Headquarters, Department of the Army, 1990), p. vii.

²US Army, FM 100-5, Operations. (Washington D.C.: Headquarters, Department of the Army, 1986), p. 13.

³US Army, Leader Development Action Plan. (Washington D.C.: Headquarters, Department of the Army, 1988), p. 10.

⁴Ibid, p. 70.

⁵US Army, Junior Officer Leader Development Study. (Ft. Leavenworth, Center for Army Leadership, 1993).

⁶US Army, DA PAM 600-32, Leader Development for the Total Army. (Washington D.C.: Headquarters, Department of the Army, 1991), p. 11.

⁷US Army, FM 25-100, Training the Force. (Washington D.C.: Headquarters, Department of the Army, 1988), p. G-3.

⁸Ibid, p. G-5.

⁹US Army, Revised DA PAM 600-32 Terms. (Ft. Leavenworth, Center for Army Leadership, 1993), p. 2.

¹⁰Ibid.

¹¹Ibid, p. 3.

¹²Ibid, p. 4.

Chapter 2

¹ US Army, FM 100-1, The Army. (Washington D.C.: Headquarters, Department of the Army, 1991), p. 12.

² US Army, FM 100-5, Operations. (Washington D.C.: Headquarters, Department of the Army, 1986), p. 12.

³ US Army, FM 22-100, Military Leadership. (Washington D.C.: Headquarters, Department of the Army, 1990), p. vii.

⁴ Ibid, p. vii.

⁵ Ibid, p. 5.

⁶ Ibid, p. 66-67.

⁷ Ibid, p. 77.

⁸ Ibid.

⁹ US Army, FM 22-101, Leadership Counseling. (Washington D.C.: Headquarters, Department of the Army, 1985), p. 8.

¹⁰ Ibid.

¹¹ US Army, DA Pam 600-32, Leader Development for the Total Army, (Washington D.C.: Headquarters, Department of the Army, 1991), p. 18-19.

¹² US Army, FM 25-100, Training the Force, (Washington D.C.: Headquarters, Department of the Army, 1988), p.1-5.

¹³ Ibid, p. 1-19.

¹⁴ Ibid, p. 1-9.

¹⁵ US Army, STP 21-II-MOS, Military Qualification Standards II, (Washington D.C.: Headquarters, Department of the Army, 1991), p.2-2.

¹⁶ Ibid, p. 2-3.

¹⁷ US Army, Ibid, p. 2-3.

18 George Forsythe, Howard Prince, John Wattendorf, and Gayle Watkins, "A Framework for Leader Development," Military Review (November, 1988), p. 19.

19 Ibid, p. 20.

20 Ibid.

21 Ibid, p. 23.

22 Ibid, p. 24.

23 Mark Littel, "Leader Development in the 1990s: One Way to Success," Army Trainer, (Fall, 1992), p. 23.

24 Ibid.

25 Ibid, p. 24.

26 Thomas W. Hayden and Mark D. Rocke, "Officer Development: A Doctrinal Imperative," Military Review, (January, 1993), p. 30.

27 Ibid, p. 31.

28 Ibid.

29 James D. McConnell, Jr., "The Omega Force," Infantry Magazine, (January-February, 1989), p. 53.

30 James M. Lyle and N. Winn Noyes, "Subaltern Stakes: Growing Lieutenants in the 3d ACR," Armor Magazine, (May-June, 1988), p. 36.

31 Ibid.

Chapter 5

¹US Army, FM 25-101, Battle Focused Training. (Washington D.C.: Headquarters, Department of the Army, 1990), p. 1-9.

²US Army, Junior Officer Leader Development Study. (Ft. Leavenworth, Center for Army Leadership, 1993).

APPENDIX
SURVEY

DEMOGRAPHIC DATA

For the following questions, circle the response that best describes your personal status.

1. What is your current rank?

- | | |
|---------|----|
| A. COL | 3 |
| B. LTC. | 18 |
| C. MAJ. | 0 |

2. What is your component?

- | | |
|------------------------|----|
| A. Active Duty | 21 |
| B. Army National Guard | 0 |
| C. Army Reserve | 0 |

3. What level command have you been selected to command?

- | | |
|------------------|----|
| A. Battalion, 05 | 20 |
| B. Brigade, 06 | 4 |
| C. Other _____ | 0 |

Answer questions 1-24 based on your personal views and a review of the enclosed Proposed Officer Leader Development Model. Circle the appropriate response for each question.

E. If you STRONGLY AGREE

D. If you AGREE

C. If you neither AGREE nor DISAGREE

B. If you DISAGREE

A. If you STRONGLY DISAGREE

	<u>A</u>	<u>B</u>	<u>C</u>	<u>D</u>	<u>E</u>
1. Officer leader development is important to me.	0	0	3	16	2
2. The Leader Development Model described in FM 25-100 is an adequate guide for unit commanders.	0	8	1	12	0
3. Certification is an effective tool for developing officers within a unit.	0	2	3	10	6
4. Certification is only applicable to lieutenants.	3	8	8	1	0
5. Certification is applicable to all officers in the unit.	0	0	7	12	2
6. Certification programs are appropriate for sustainment training.	0	7	4	9	1
7. I plan to have a certification program in my next unit.	0	1	2	11	6
8. Peer feedback is a useful self-development tool.	0	1	9	11	0
9. Subordinate feedback is a useful self-development tool.	1	2	6	11	0
10. Commanders should review an officer's peer and subordinate feedback	3	8	5	5	0
11. I plan on using subordinate assessments for my own development.	2	5	6	7	1
12. MQS is a useful officer leader development tool.	1	0	3	15	1
13. I have used MQS for my subordinates' development.	0	2	10	8	1

E. If you STRONGLY AGREE

D. If you AGREE

C. If you neither AGREE nor DISAGREE

B. If you DISAGREE

A. If you STRONGLY DISAGREE

	<u>A</u>	<u>B</u>	<u>C</u>	<u>D</u>	<u>E</u>
14. Assignments should be based on the officer's level of development, not time in the job.	0	2	10	7	1
15. An effective officer leader development program can improve the unit's command climate.	0	0	3	8	10
16. Officer leader development can be integrated into all unit activities.	0	1	1	10	9
17. An effective officer leader development program can improve unit performance.	0	0	3	6	12
18. Unit missions are more effective in developing junior officers than leader development programs.	0	6	8	5	2
19. Assessment, feedback, and counseling are critical for an officer's leader development.	0	0	0	8	13
20. Reading programs are a useful officer leader development tool.	0	0	5	14	2
21. Reading programs should focus on the unit's mission.	0	9	5	5	2
22. I plan to have a reading program for officers in my unit.	0	1	6	11	4
23. The Proposed Officer Leader Development Model provides a useful guide for officer leader development.	0	1	4	11	5
24. A Leader Development Training Circular focused at unit-level is needed.	1	6	3	4	7

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Periodicals and Articles

- Anastasio, Michael A. "Leader Development, Direction for the Future," Military Review (May 1991): 10-16.
- Calloway, Cecil B. "Leadership Imperatives," Military Review (November 1986): 55-63.
- Flanagan, E.M. "Mentoring-Taking Time to Communicate," Army (September 1992): 61-62.
- Forsythe, George B.; Prince, Howard T.; Wattendorf, John M.; and Watkins, Gayle L. "A Framework for Leader Development," Military Review (November 1988): 17-27.
- Gardner, Gregory C. "A Team Focus for Leadership," Military Review (March 1987): 74-79.
- Geier, Richard P. "How Do You Conduct Officer Professional Development?" Armor Magazine (September-October, 1990): 38-41.
- Hayden, Thomas W.. and Rocke, Mark D. "Officer Development: A Doctrinal Imperative," Military Review (January 1993): 27-37.
- Jolemore, Kenneth A. "The Mentor: "More Than a Teacher, More Than a Coach," Military Review (July 1986): 5-17.
- Littel, Mark T. "Leader Development in the 1990's: One Way to Success," Army Trainer (Fall 1992): 23-24.
- Lyle, James M. and Noyes, N. Winn. "Subaltern Stakes: Growing Lieutenants in the 3d ACR," (May-June 1988): 36-37.
- McDonough, James R. "Leadership for the New Lieutenant," Military Review (November 1988): 63-68.
- McConnel, James D. "The Omega Force," Infantry Magazine (January-February 1989): 33-35.

Palmer, Ray. "Developing Army Leaders, The Leadership Assessment and Development Process," Military Review (April 1990): 33-44.

Richardson, William R. "Training: Preparation for Combat," Military Review (June 1986): 5-10.

Vuono, Carl E. "Professionalism and the Army of the 1990s," Military Review (April 1986): 2-10.

Government Documents

U.S. Army. DA Pam 600-3, Commissioned Officer Development and Career Management (Coordinating Draft). Washington, DC: Department of the Army, 1993.

U.S. Army. DA Pam 600-32, Leader Development For the Total Army. Washington, DC: Department of the Army, 1991.

U.S. Army. DA PAM 600-50, Leadership White Paper. Washington, DC: Department of the Army, 1985.

U.S. Army. FM 22-103, Leadership and Command at Senior Levels. Washington, DC: Department of the Army, 1987.

U.S. Army. FM 22-100, Military Leadership. Washington, DC: Department of the Army, 1990.

U.S. Army. FM 22-101, Leadership Counseling. Washington, DC: Department of the Army, 1985.

U.S. Army. FM 25-100, Training the Force. Washington, DC: Department of the Army, 1988.

U.S. Army. FM 25-101, Battle Focused Training. Washington, DC: Department of the Army, September 1990.

U.S. Army. FM 100-1, The Army. Washington, DC: Department of the Army, 1991.

U.S. Army. FM 100-5, Operations. Washington, DC: Department of the Army, 1986.

U.S. Army. Leader Development Action Plan. Washington, DC: Department of the Army, April 1988.

U.S. Army. STP 21-II-MOS, Military Qualification Standards II, Manual of Common Tasks for Lieutenants and Captains. Washington, DC: Department of the Army, 1991.

U.S. Army. TC 22-9-3, Leader Development Program, Military Professionalism (Bn). Washington, DC: Department of the Army, 1986.

Unpublished Materials

Harris, W.R., and J.A. Miller. Squadron Commander Involvement Program. 1989.

Lempke, Duane A. Command Climate: The Rise and Fall of a Military Concept. Army War College. 1988.

Lewandowski, Francis. Air Force Mentoring: The Mentor's Perspective. Wright-Patterson Air Force Base. 1985.

Mangelsdorf, A.D., and J.M. King. Cohesion and Motivation: Multi-National Efforts in the Armed Forces. Fort Sam Houston, Texas. 1985.

Marashian, Charles D. A Study of Human Factors that Affect Combat Effectiveness on the Battlefield. Naval Post Graduate School. 1982.

McGee, Michael L. Officer Leadership Development (OLD) Program. APO NY 09139. 22 September, 1989.

Uecker, M.E. Mentoring and Leadership Development in the Officer Corps of the United States Air Force. Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Ohio. 1984.

U.S. Army, Junior Officer Leader Development Study. Fort Leavenworth, Kansas. 1993.

U.S. Army, Leader Development Study. Fort Leavenworth, Kansas. August 1987.

INITIAL DISTRIBUTION LIST

1. Combined Arms Research Library
U.S. Army Command and General Staff College
Fort Leavenworth, KS 66027-6900
2. Defense Technical Information Center
Cameron Station
Alexandria, VA 22314
3. Brigadier General William M. Steele
Deputy Commandant
USACGSC
Fort Leavenworth, KS 66027-6900
4. Brigadier General Gerald A. Miller Ph.D.
Department of Agronomy
Iowa State University
Ames, IA 50011
5. Major Benjamin Taylor
Center for Army Leadership
USACGSC
Fort Leavenworth, KS 66027-6900
6. Dr. Sue Mettlin
Center for Army Leadership
USACGSC
Fort Leavenworth, KS 66027-6900
7. Lieutenant Colonel Michael F. Keohane
Center for Army Leadership
USACGSC
Fort Leavenworth, KS 66027-6900
8. Lieutenant Colonel Tom Sterner
Center for Army Leadership
USACGSC
Fort Leavenworth, KS 66027-6900