



**STRATEGY
RESEARCH
PROJECT**

The views expressed in this paper are those of the author and do not necessarily reflect the views of the Department of Defense or any of its agencies. This document may not be released for open publication until it has been cleared by the appropriate military service or government agency.

**REVAMPING THE ARMY EQUAL OPPORTUNITY TRAINING
PROGRAM FOR THE 21ST CENTURY AND BEYOND**

BY

LIEUTENANT COLONEL KEITH C. BLOWE
United States Army

DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A:
Approved for Public Release.
Distribution is Unlimited.

USAWC CLASS OF 2002



U.S. ARMY WAR COLLEGE, CARLISLE BARRACKS, PA 17013-5050

20020502 066

USAWC STRATEGY RESEARCH PROJECT

**REVAMPING THE ARMY EQUAL OPPORTUNITY TRAINING PROGRAM
FOR THE 21ST CENTURY AND BEYOND**

by

Lieutenant Colonel Keith C. Blowe
United States Army

Colonel Cortez Dial
Project Advisor

The views expressed in this academic research paper are those of the author and do not necessarily reflect the official policy or position of the U.S. Government, the Department of Defense, or any of its agencies.

U.S. Army War College
CARLISLE BARRACKS, PENNSYLVANIA 17013

DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A:

Approved for public release.
Distribution is unlimited.

ABSTRACT

AUTHOR: Lieutenant Colonel Keith C. Blowe
TITLE: Revamping The Army Equal Opportunity Training Program For The 21st and Beyond
FORMAT: Strategy Research Project
DATE: 09 April 2002 PAGES: 35 CLASSIFICATION: Unclassified

The Army Chief of Staff is leading the Army's most comprehensive transformation process undertaken in decades. In this transformation process, the Army remains a values based organization that continues to lead our society in treating its people with dignity and respect. Although the Army is working on transforming its overall structure for the 21st Century and beyond, there is little evidence that indicates the Army is also looking at what will be needed to transform or revamp its Equal Opportunity Training Program. An effective Equal Opportunity (EO) Training Program provides an excellent tool to assist in addressing complex cultural, diversity, and readiness issues in the 21st Century. Maintaining an effective Army EO program clearly supports the interpersonal skills core competency (one of the three core competencies for strategic leaders for the 21st century), which will assist leaders in developing needed trans-cultural skills. In addressing this issue of Army EO training transformation, I will review origins of the program, assess the current status of the training program to include problems and propose concepts for making the Army EO training program more relevant for the 21st century and the objective force.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT	III
PREFACE.....	VII
REVAMPING THE ARMY EQUAL OPPORTUNITY TRAINING PROGRAM FOR THE 21 ST CENTURY AND BEYOND.....	1
BACKGROUND	3
HISTORY OF THE ARMY EO PROGRAM.....	4
ARMY EO TRAINING PROGRAM	5
EO ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE.....	6
ASSESSMENT OF CURRENT EO TRAINING PROGRAM	6
DA EO ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE:	7
DODIG REPORT OF 2000:	7
ATLDP OFFICER STUDY FINAL REPORT:.....	8
WAR COLLEGE EO SURVEY DATA ANALYSIS:	10
SURVEY CONCLUSIONS:	16
PERSONAL EXPERIENCE AS A DIVISION EO ADVISOR:.....	16
ARMY EO TRAINING PROGRAM ASSESSMENT CONCLUSIONS:.....	17
THE FUTURE ARMY EO TRAINING PROGRAM	19
CONCLUSIONS	20
ENDNOTES.....	23
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	25

PREFACE

I continue to be eternally grateful and feel extremely blessed to have the undying support of my wife, Deborah. For many years you have sacrificed your own very distinguished career in support of my career. I can always depend on your honest foresight and assessment of my work both professionally and in my private life.

I owe a tremendous debt of gratitude to Dr. Anna Waggener USAWC, Department of Academic Affairs. Dr. Waggener went above and beyond the call of duty in assisting me with developing, formatting, collecting, and analyzing survey data from the Army War College Class of 2002, for this project.

Finally, thank-you Colonel Cortez Dial (project advisor) for your honest and detailed assessment of this project. Your stern and demanding schedule forced me to stay focused and to complete this project early in term II of the academic year.

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE 1 – U.S. CENSUS 2000 TRENDS	2
TABLE 2 – ARMY DEMOGRAPHIC TRENDS	2
TABLE 3 - GENDER.....	11
TABLE 4 - ETHNICITY	11
TABLE 5 - BRANCH	12
TABLE 6 – WHERE YOU COMMANDED	12
TABLE 7 – TYPE COMMAND	12
TABLE 8 – LEADER INVOLVEMENT	13
TABLE 9 – LEADER ATTENDANCE AT TRAINING	13
TABLE 10 – QUARTERLY EO TRAINING REQUIREMENTS	13
TABLE 11 – TRAINING VALIDATION	14
TABLE 12 – SENIOR LEADER INVOLVEMENT IN TRAINING	14
TABLE 13 – CONTINUATION OF MANDATORY TRAINING	14
TABLE 14 – EO COMPLAINTS	15
TABLE 15 – CHANGING EO TRAINING REQUIREMENTS	15
TABLE 16 – WRITE-IN COMMENTS.....	15

REVAMPING THE ARMY EQUAL OPPORTUNITY TRAINING PROGRAM FOR THE 21ST CENTURY AND BEYOND

Respect for the individual forms the basis for the rule of law, the very essence of what makes America. In the Army, respect means recognizing and appreciating the inherent dignity and worth of all people. This value reminds you that your people are your greatest resource. Army leaders honor everyone's individual worth by treating all people with dignity and respect. As America becomes more culturally diverse, Army leaders must be aware that they will deal with people from a wider range of ethnic, racial and religious backgrounds. Effective leaders are tolerant of beliefs different from their own as long as those beliefs do not conflict with Army values, are illegal, and are not unethical. As an Army leader, you need to avoid misunderstandings arising from cultural differences. Actively seeking to learn about people and cultures different from your own can help you do this. Being sensitive to other cultures can also aid you in counseling your people more effectively. You show respect when you seek to understand your people's background, see things from their perspective and appreciate what's important to them."¹

— Army Leadership, FM 22-100

As a result of the events of 11 September 2001 (World Trade Center), I was initially very unsure as to the significance of research work geared toward changing how the U.S. Army executes its Equal Opportunity Training. I thought to myself that this type of research would not make the radar screen in light of what most see as more pressing and critical matters regarding our nation's Homeland Defense and the Global War on Terrorism. As the months passed by and I had the opportunity to listen to numerous talk shows and debates; read numerous articles; and through study at the U.S. Army War College, I have gain a renewed enthusiasm for the importance and significance of this research. As a part of our study at the U.S. Army War College, I had the opportunity to review Samuel Huntington's, "The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of World Order."

Huntington identifies conflicts in the 21st century not occurring between nation states (Russia and United States) but between civilizations, which have different values, cultures, and religions.² Some believe that the events of 11 September 2001 are clear signs of the beginning of this 'clash of civilizations'. Whether this assessment is true or not remains to be seen. However, our nation and military cannot afford to neglect Huntington's recommendations for addressing these critical issues. In Huntington's words, "...must emphasize what civilizations have in common, the values and institutions, the arts and philosophy and morality, that can peacefully cross borders." Huntington goes on to state that if humans are ever to develop a

universal civilization, it will emerge gradually through exploration and expansion of these commonalities.³

My exposure to Huntington's work leads me to believe that now more than ever, our nation and our Army must review how we deal with diversity, interaction with different cultures and Army leader development as each of these are invariably linked. Our nation and our Army are becoming increasingly more diverse. The U.S. Census of 2000 illustrates clearly that during the ten-year period 1990 – 2000, the Caucasian population declined while minority populations, especially Hispanics, increased from 9% to 11.9% of the total U.S. population.⁴ These same demographic trends are replicated in the Army over the past eleven years. The Army Caucasian population continues to decline while minority populations (African Americans, Hispanics and Women) continues to increase. The Hispanic population in the Army has increased over the last eleven-year period from 3.9% to 8.6%.⁵ At current rates Caucasians are predicted to be a minority in the United States within the next twenty or thirty years. These trends add up to a more diverse workforce for the future in our nation and in our Army.

U.S. Census 2000	1990	1992	1994	1996	1998	2000
White Non-Hispanic	83.9%	83.5%	83.1%	82.8%	82.5%	82.2%
Black Non-Hispanic	12.3%	12.3%	12.5%	12.6%	12.7%	12.8%
Hispanic	9.0%	9.5%	10.0%	10.6%	11.2%	11.9%
Native Americans	0.8%	0.8%	0.9%	0.9%	0.9%	0.9%
Asian/Pacific Islanders	3.0%	3.3%	3.5%	3.6%	3.9%	4.1%

TABLE 1 – U.S. CENSUS 2000 TRENDS

Army Demographics	1989	1991	1993	1995	1997	1999	2000
White Non-Hispanic	63.4%	62.5%	62.4%	61.8%	60.5%	59.2 %	58.4%
Black Non-Hispanic	28.4%	28.7%	27.6%	27.0%	26.7%	26.5%	26.5%
Hispanic	3.9%	4.1%	4.7%	5.2%	6.4%	7.6%	8.6%
Native Americans	0.5%	0.5%	0.5%	0.6%	0.7%	0.7%	0.8%
Asian Americans	1.6%	1.7%	2.0%	2.2%	2.5%	2.9%	3.1%
Other/Unknown	2.2%	2.4%	2.8%	3.2%	3.2%	3.1%	2.6%

TABLE 2 – ARMY DEMOGRAPHIC TRENDS

The aforementioned demographic trends indicate that effective leaders in the 21st century and beyond, must be experts at managing diverse workgroups, building and maintaining coalitions with our allies, need strong conflict management skills, and must be able to address the gap between Generation X employees, baby boomers and cross-cultural differences.⁶ What do these demographic trends and special skill set requirements mean for our Army in the 21st Century and beyond?

The Army Chief of Staff is leading the Army's most comprehensive transformation process undertaken in decades. In this transformation process, the Army remains a values based organization that continues to lead our society in treating its people with dignity and respect. This transformation process will require a review of Army Leader Development programs to determine core competencies required for military leaders for the 21st century and beyond. The Army has used its Equal Opportunity (EO) Program as a tool too assist in addressing complex cultural, diversity, and readiness issues for the past thirty years. Does the Army EO program have what it needs to serve as a vital tool to assist in developing culturally diverse leaders of the future? Based on current demographic trends we know that tomorrow's leaders will include more minorities and a gender shift of more women, quite different from the demographic makeup of today's top leaders.⁷ I believe that an effective Army EO training program will serve as an en-valuable tool that will assist in developing strategic leaders with critical *interpersonal and trans-cultural skills* for the 21st century.⁸ In reviewing the issue of revamping the Army EO training program, I will look at origins of the program, assess the current status of the program to include current problems and propose concepts for making the Army EO training program more relevant for the 21st century and beyond.

BACKGROUND

Why do we have or need an Army EO training program? Some senior leaders ponder this question and many state privately that our Army has progressed to the point in which a program such as this is no longer required. After all, our military leads the nation in its efforts on integration, allowing minorities to excel to the highest heights based on their potential. Others say that we are a values based organization that treats all of our people with dignity and respect. We do this daily and therefore, we do not have to talk EO, as it is currently understood. It would be great if it was truly that simple, but in fact sometimes "we do not know that we do not know."⁹

In July 2001, the Gallup Polling Organization released a report on black/white relations in America. That 'Social Audit Report' showed a persistent gap (21%) between the way blacks and

whites view America and the world today.¹⁰ This poll suggests while we have made great advances of racial/cultural acceptance in our society, we still have work to do both in society and within our military. I am in no way suggesting that race issues in our Nation or in the military for that matter are as bad as they were in 1949, when President Truman issued two executive orders banning color bias in the armed services and federal civil service. However, understanding that our military is a mere subset of our bigger society requires the Army continue dialoguing to keep racial issues in the forefront of our transformation process, in order to fully capitalize on previous successes in this area. As we attempt to build upon these previous successes, it is critical that we understand from whence we have come.

HISTORY OF THE ARMY EO PROGRAM

President Truman's 1949 directives were twofold. The intent of the military Directive was to insure equality of treatment and equal opportunity for all persons in the Armed Services without regard to race, religion, or national origin. The intent of the civil service directive was to eliminate racial discrimination from personnel actions and make promotions-selections based solely on merit and fitness. Two boards were established to develop plans to implement the President's directives. The military advisory group was known as the "President's Committee on Equality of Treatment and Opportunity in the Armed Services." It was called the "Fair Employment Board" for civilian workers.¹¹ It took over two decades after President Truman signed these directives, along with the results of the Kerner Commission Study, the racial unrest of the 60s and a Department of Defense (DOD) inter-service study, before the beginning of changes in our military. As John Kotter states, "change requires time."

Air Force Major General Lucius Theus led the DOD inter-service task force study, which examined causes and possible cures of racial discord within the military. The results of this task force led to Department of Defense Directive 1322.1 that established the Race Relations Education Board and created the Defense Race Relations Institute (DRRI) in 1971. In 1979, DRRI was renamed the Defense Equal Opportunity Management Institute (DEOMI), to reflect the multiple issues addressed by the Institute, including sexual harassment, sexism, extremism, religious accommodations, and anti-Semitism.

Along with the establishment of DEOMI in 1971, the Office of Equal Opportunity Programs was established as part of the Office of the Deputy Chief of Staff for Personnel (ODCSPER). Its mission was to establish the Army's EO program consisting of education and training initiatives and the Army's affirmative action plan (AAP). This action formally institutionalized a program to deal with racial strife, i.e., confrontational sensitivity training. In July 1973, Headquarters

Department of the Army (HQDA) began the process of combining the race relations (RR) and EO programs. Race Relations programs were seen as actions designed to eliminate prejudice by promoting racial harmony and attitudes that support Army objectives. The EO programs were actions designed to correct structural discrimination deficiencies and eliminate personal and institutional discrimination against minorities. More dramatic changes were made to the program in September 1977 to include a name change from RR/EO to just EO. Major commands were required to supplement the AR with their own directives and specific guidance was given for the conduct of EO training in units. Between the 1970's and mid-1980's, organizational changes caused HQDA's "EO office" to become part of the Office of Military Personnel Management.

By March 1988, the "stand alone" EO regulation (AR 600-21) was incorporated into AR 600-20, "Army Command Policy," aligning EO as a responsibility of leadership and as a function of command. In late 1990, HQDA re-established the Human Resources Directorate in the Office of the Deputy Chief of Staff for Personnel (ODCSPER). ODCSPER published Changes 4 and 5 to AR 600-20 in January 1994 and July 1999 respectively. These changes overhauled the complaint process, established EO Hotlines at all installations, and re-addressed mandatory training requirements.¹²

ARMY EO TRAINING PROGRAM

One common recommendation resulting from every study conducted in reference to EO training is that success depends upon a vibrant, up-to-date, challenging education and training program. The Army mandated initially "prime time" monthly training seminars in units on racial awareness. The focus for most of this early training was "confrontational," aimed at identifying racist behaviors, examining the impacts of that behavior and working to diffuse these issues among those attending the training. This type of race relations/equal opportunity training was mandated for all entry-level training and leadership/professional development courses.

February 1973 saw the first General Officer RR/EO Orientation and Seminar conducted throughout the Army. On 1 February 1974, AR 600-42, "Race Relations Education in the Army," established a comprehensive educational program for all members of the Army. In March 1977, the Army published DA PAM 600-42, "Unit Equal Opportunity Discussion Outlines," complementing institutional training with unit training. This DA PAM supported Training and Doctrine Command (TRADOC) guidance of the Uniform Service School Standards for Race Relations/Equal Opportunity Instruction published in December 1976.¹³

In 1984, Army training regulations mandated EO training in all resident Professional Military Education (PME) courses as well as refresher training (done after local commander's assessment) at the unit level. Since late 1990, ODCSPER and the Commanding General (CG) TRADOC have worked together to assure that adequate and appropriate EO and prevention of sexual harassment training are in the formal curricula of all PME courses. This brings us to the present organization and a brief look at key responsibilities within the Army EO community.

The past thirty years have brought significant changes to our world, our Army, and to the EO Program. The EO Program transitioned its training paradigm from "confrontation—and diffuse" through discussion in the 1970s to "situational training with appropriate responses" for specific discrimination situations in the 1980s and to its current "small group facilitation sessions" modeled after the Military District of Washington's (MDW) consideration of others training model. Significant changes have occurred in training but few have occurred organizationally.

EO ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE

Current organizational structure of the Army EO program illustrates a tremendous amount of bureaucracy. The Deputy Chief of Staff for Personnel (DCSPER), Human Resources Division, Leadership-Branch, is the responsible agency for Army-wide policies, plans, and overall assessment of the Army's EO Program. The Commanding General U.S. Army Forces Command, (CG, FORSCOM) has the responsibility for supervising and evaluating all unit EO training within the continental United States. The CG, TRADOC is responsible for developing EO training doctrine, training materials, and conducting EO training in service schools/centers, as well as establishing the Soldier Support Institute (SSI) as TRADOC's proponent for EO training. Commanders of Major Army Commands (MACOM) are responsible for monitoring the application of the EO program within their commands, providing personnel and funding to carry out the program, and submitting Quarterly Narrative Statistical Reports (QNSR) to HQDA. Commanders at each lower level corps, division, brigade, battalion, and company are responsible for EO training within their organizations and monitoring and maintaining an acceptable unit climate-free of discrimination and sexual harassment.¹⁴ After over thirty years in existence, is the Army EO training program meeting the needs of our Army for the 21st century and beyond?

ASSESSMENT OF CURRENT EO TRAINING PROGRAM

In an attempt to provide a fair assessment of the Army's current EO training program, information will be reviewed and analyzed from five areas: Department of the Army (DA) EO

Organization Structure; Department of Defense Inspector General (DODIG) Report; Army Training and Leader Development Panel (ATLDP), Officer Study Final Report; U.S. Army War College Survey; and personal experience serving as a Division Equal Opportunity Advisor in one of our Army's premiere Divisions.

DA EO ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE:

As previously discussed, the DA EO organizational structure is ineffective. The top level of management delineation of responsibility for the Army EO Program is split between TRADOC and ODESPER. TRADOC is responsible for training and ODESPER is responsible for leader development. This structure is ineffective and non-responsive to constant changing requirements in the field.¹⁵ The lack of a single proponent for training and leader development results in unsynchronized policy and resources. Additionally, there is not a funding line in the POM for leader development. If training and leader development are to be linked, the responsibility for both should rest with a single proponent on the DA Staff. This problem was identified in the ATLDP study conducted in 2000, along with a recommendation to designate one DA agent to be responsible for the entire EO program for our Army.¹⁶

DODIG REPORT OF 2000:

In December 1999, the Secretary of Defense (William Cohen) directed that the DODIG conduct an assessment throughout the Department of Defense (DOD), of the environment regarding the application of the homosexual conduct policy.¹⁷ The DODIG assessment focused on three areas:

- 1) "...extent of disparaging speech or expression with respect to homosexuality occurred and was tolerated.
- 2) ...extent to which harassment of service members based on perceived or alleged homosexuality occurred or was tolerated.
- 3) ...whether service members had been trained on the homosexual conduct policy and whether they understood the policy."¹⁸

For the purpose of my research, I will concentrate on the report results regarding service member training of the homosexual conduct policy. These results are significant as they clearly demonstrate that 57 percent of the 71,570 respondents from throughout the armed services indicated that they had not received training on the homosexual conduct policy.¹⁹ Specifically, Army respondent results to the training questions revealed that 45.3 percent had not received training on the DOD homosexuality conduct policy.²⁰

The less than 50 percent response to receiving homosexual conduct policy training from Army respondents is extremely telling and relevant to this research on the Army EO training Program. Within the Army's EO program, three areas of training are included:

- 1) EO and Prevention of Sexual Harassment (POSH) – Training designed to provide equal opportunity and treatment for soldiers, civilians and employees and their families without regard to race, color, religion, gender or national origin.
- 2) Consideration of Others (CO2) – Aimed at strengthening unit cohesion and respect for others within units through open communications in small groups to improve work environments and teamwork.
- 3) Soldier Responsibility Training (SRT) – focuses on individual soldier understanding of the basic values into goals for personal behavior in common everyday life.²¹

It is my belief, if less than 50 percent of respondents throughout the DOD, reported that they had not received mandatory training on the Homosexual Conduct Policy, it is extremely likely that at minimum this same percent is not receiving related mandatory EO training as well. This fact is more disturbing as these mandatory training requirements have been in effect since February 1994. These results are in line with other EO training data included in this research project, specifically the "EO Training Survey" from the Army War College, Class of 2002, which indicates that although EO training is mandated, it is not being conducted to the required standard.²²

ATLDP OFFICER STUDY FINAL REPORT:

In early 2000, the Chief of Staff, Army (CSA), General Shinseki chartered the ATLDP to look at training and leader development as a part of the Army's Transformation Campaign Plan. The results of the ATLDP presented to the CSA in October 2000, indicated "...soldiers and their families are the Army's center of gravity..." and that "...a main effort in Army Transformation should be to link training and leader development to prepare Army leaders..." for the future.²³

The ATLDP traveled around the world to 61 different locations and obtained input from over 13,500 Army service members (13.5% of army end-strength). The information was obtained through a combination of surveys, focus group interviews, personal interviews, and independent research data to arrive at its conclusions.²⁴ Although the ATLDP findings and recommendations were extensive, I will only refer to four of the panel's recommendations as they have a direct correlation to the effectiveness of the Army EO training program.

First, the ATLDP identified that the Army's current leader development model is outdated. The current model does not reflect an integrated and progressive training and leader development model. If our Army is to become a learning organization the appropriate training and leader development model must include these principles: Army culture, standards, feedback, experience, education, self-development and training. A linked training and leader development model based on these principles produces self-aware, adaptive leaders, and trained and ready units.²⁵

Second, the current proponent for training and leader development is vested in separate DA Staff elements. The Deputy Chief of Staff, Operations is responsible for training and the Deputy Chief of Staff, Personnel is responsible for leader development. The ATLDP recommends that in order for training and leader development to be fully linked, a single DA Staff element must have responsibility for training and leader development with an appropriate funding line in the Army POM.²⁶

Third, operational pace must be reduced in order to address micromanagement and to facilitate the conditions for effective leader development. One way to address operational pace is to incorporate into the CSA's DA Training Guidance and AR 350-1, the elimination of non-mission-related compliance training in AR 350-41, *Training in Units*, and other DA-and MACOM-Level documents.²⁷ Current mandatory EO training would fall within this category.

Fourth, the ATLDP reinforced strict adherence to already accepted training and leader development principles. These principles are outlined in FM 25-100, *Training the Force* and FM 25-100, *Army Leadership* and are listed below.

Mission Focused	Leader as Primary Trainer
Doctrinally Based	Know Yourself
Performance Oriented	Lifelong Learning
Train as You Fight	Mentorship ²⁸

For the purposes of my research I will focus only on the panel's recommendations regarding *leader as primary trainers* and *know your self*. These two principles directly relate to EO training. The ATLDP points out that "...leaders are responsible for planning, preparing, executing, assessing and providing feed back to their units and soldiers. Leaders personal participation in each step of training is essential as they set the azimuth for their unit's accomplishments to the standards the Army has set. Leaders must be present at training."²⁹

The Know yourself principle establishes that "...self-aware and adaptive leaders are the basis for success in full spectrum operations. The relationship between self-awareness and adaptability is symbiotic. The greater self-awareness gained by assessment against

measurable standards, the more adaptive the leaders. Through commitment to lifelong learning enabled by self-development, leaders can narrow the knowledge gaps not provided through education and operational experiences."³⁰

The aforementioned findings and recommendations have direct impact on the Army EO Training program. Each of the four findings further support other research data which indicates that current training and leadership development models are not effective for the 21st century and beyond; a single DA Staff element proponent must have the responsibility for developing effective training and leader development programs; all non-mission-related compliance training (EO training) must be eliminated in order to reduce unit operational pace; and leaders must be involved in and present at training to maximize benefits to the unit.

WAR COLLEGE EO SURVEY DATA ANALYSIS:

The Army War College survey attempted to obtain input from battalion level commanders who completed command less than two years ago. The survey had a 15% response rate of those eligible to participate. Initially, one might think that a 15% response rate is low for a survey but I would like to point out that the Army Training and Leader Development Panel Report, commissioned by the Army Chief of Staff in June 2000, only had a 13.5% response rate for the entire army.³¹ The information requested in the Army War College survey attempts to determine the level of previous battalion commanders' involvement in their unit's EO training program. Additionally, the survey-solicited input regarding what changes if any they feel should be made (maintain, minor changes or elimination) of current mandatory EO training requirements.

Majority officers (white male) and combat arms officers clearly have more disparity in how they view the EO training program than minority officers (African Americans, Women, Hispanics, etc.) and combat support, and combat service support officers. By a clear margin, majority and combat arms officers support elimination of EO mandatory training requirements because in their view, valuable training time is wasted and sometimes the training negatively impacts the command climate.³²

On the other hand, minority officers (African Americans, Women, Hispanics, etc.) by far seemed to have more positive feelings toward EO training programs and support continuation of existing training requirements. Minority officers overwhelmingly view many senior majority leaders as only providing halfhearted support for the EO training programs and feel more lip service is provided than genuine support.

The data indicates that overall commanders were not as involved in their unit EO training programs as the regulation requires and if they could they would eliminate or make major changes in current mandatory EO training requirements at unit level.

The data is also somewhat misleading. A lack of understanding of current EO training requirements was most evident in comments which indicate that EO training programs should be given back to commanders and EO should concentrate more on leadership. The current program is designed to meet these objectives. Participant's response to questions on average suggests medium range support for the program with only minor changes recommended. These results contrast with the participant's write-in comments, which suggest elimination of current EO training requirements.³³

Personal Data:

Tables 3 – 7 focus on background information of survey participants. The information requested in this section include gender, ethnicity, branch, if they commanded in a Division and tactical versus table of distribution and allowance (TDA) unit. A profile breakdown identifies 86% of the survey participants as majority (white non-Hispanic males) officers compared to 14% minority (includes women) officers. Of the 29 participants 45% commanded in the combat arms, and 48% in combat support arms. Although 65% of the participants did not command in a Division, 69% did command tactical units as oppose to 31% commanding TDA type units.

<i>What is your Gender:</i>	<i>Item</i>
Male	86% (25)
Female	13% (4)

TABLE 3 - GENDER

<i>What is your ethnicity:</i>	<i>Item</i>
White Non Hispanic	86% (25)
Native American	.03% (1)
African American	10% (3)
Hispanic	0
Asian/Pacific Islander	0
Other	0

TABLE 4 - ETHNICITY

<i>What is your branch:</i>	<i>Item</i>
Combat Arms	45% (13)
Combat Support	48% (14)
Combat Service Support	.06% (2)

TABLE 5 - BRANCH

<i>Did you command in a Division:</i>	<i>Item</i>
Yes	34% (10)
No	65% (19)

TABLE 6 – WHERE YOU COMMANDED

<i>Type organization you commanded</i>	<i>Item</i>
Tactical	69% (20)
Table of Distribution & Allowance	31% (9)
Agency	0
Separate Battalion	0
Other	0

TABLE 7 – TYPE COMMAND

EO Training Program:

Tables 8 – 12 depicts data relating to the level of involvement of battalion, brigade, and higher-level commanders in the Army EO training program. Army Regulations (AR) 600-20 (Army Leadership), dated July 1999, Chapter 6, mandates that EO training be conducted within company level units once per quarter (four times annually). Of these four unit-training sessions, a minimum of two sessions must be conducted on the Prevention of Sexual Harassment (POSH), and the other two sessions as commanders direct on other EO related subjects. Executive level training seminars are required twice annually. Typically, a Division level commander would host an executive training seminar for his battalion and brigade level commanders and above and senior civilian equivalent subordinates. AR 600-20 further directs that unit commanders and other leaders be active participants with their soldiers in unit level EO training sessions.

41% of the survey participants identified that they were frequently involved in the selection of EO related training subjects. Commander's input to EO training subjects occurred doing quarterly training briefing sessions with their subordinated commanders.

During a two-year command period 28% and 10% respectively were seldom or never involved in the subject selection process for unit EO training.

Leader Involvement in EO Training (Tables 8 – 12)

Leader involvement in unit EO training subject selection:	Item
Always	21% (6)
Frequently	41% (12)
Seldom	28% (8)
Never	10% (3)

TABLE 8 – LEADER INVOLVEMENT

Commanders and other leaders are required to be active participants with their soldiers in unit level EO training sessions. Based on a five company battalion, each unit required to conduct a quarterly EO training session, at minimum, a battalion commander would have twenty (20) opportunities per year (40 per two year command tour) to visit and take part in subordinated unit EO training sessions. 45% of survey respondents indicated that they attended more than 6 but less than 8 EO training sessions within a two-year command tour, out of a possible 40 training sessions.

Leader attendance at EO unit training:	Item
Always (> 8 times)	41% (12)
Frequently (> 6 times)	45% (13)
Seldom (<2 times)	10% (3)
Never	.03% (1)

TABLE 9 – LEADER ATTENDANCE AT TRAINING

Unit met quarterly EO training requirements:	Item
Always	59% (17)
Frequently (>70%)	34% (10)
Seldom (<50%)	.03% (1)
Never	.03% (1)

TABLE 10 – QUARTERLY EO TRAINING REQUIREMENTS

Previous battalion level commanders indicated that 34% of them personally checked to validate how EO training was being accomplished within their units while 28% used a combination of personally checking and designating other subordinates to check their EO training.

Validation of EO training in your unit:	Item
Personally Checked	34% (10)
Designated Subordinates to Check	34% (10)
Personally Checked & Designated Subordinates to Check	28% (8)
Did not Validate conduct of EO training	.03% (1)

TABLE 11 – TRAINING VALIDATION

34% of survey respondents indicated that their senior commanders (Brigade Commander through Division Commander) very seldom discussed EO training with them and 41% of them responded that their Brigade level commander never checked EO training during their two-year tenure as commander.

It is clear from the data provided that in most cases senior leaders (brigade commander's and above) had little involvement in EO related training other than in quarterly training brief settings. About 48% of participants indicated that this was the case and outside of these sessions, little or nothing was said pertaining to EO related training.

The following responses indicate Senior Leader involvement in EO training:	Always > once per quarter	Frequently > twice annually	Seldom Once per quarter	Never
Brigade level Commander discussed EO training with Battalion level Commander:	(7) 24%	(8) 27%	(10) 34%	(4) 13%
Brigade level Commander Checked your unit EO training:	(1) 3%	(10) 34%	(6) 21%	(12) 41%
Superior above Brigade level Commander questioned you about Battalion EO training:	(3) 10%	(7) 24%	(10) 34%	(9) 31%
Superior above Brigade level Commander gave you guidance regarding EO training:	(5) 17%	(9) 31%	(14) 48%	(1) 3%

TABLE 12 – SENIOR LEADER INVOLVEMENT IN TRAINING

Data analysis to this point indicates moderate involvement in the EO training program during the participant's tenure as commanders. However, when asked directly if the EO training program positively impacts unit readiness and if mandatory EO training requirements should be maintained, an overwhelming 65% responded no to each of these questions.

The following responses indicate overall views Of the current Army EO training requirements:	Yes	No
Does current mandatory EO training requirements positively impact unit readiness:	(10) 34%	(19) 65%
Should current mandatory EO training requirements be maintained:	(10) 34%	(19) 65%

TABLE 13 – CONTINUATION OF MANDATORY TRAINING

Number of EO complaints in unit during your commander:	Item
0-2	76% (22)
3-5	21% (6)
More than 5	3% (1)

TABLE 14 – EO COMPLAINTS

Participant's responses for maintaining current EO training requirements or making minor changes in the training requirement were almost evenly split. 34% of participants responded yes to maintaining current training requirements and 31% responded for making changes to training requirements.

Recommendations for changes in mandatory EO training requirements:	Item
Maintain current mandatory EO training requirements	34% (10)
Make minor changes in mandatory EO training requirements	31% (9)
Eliminate mandatory EO training requirements	21% (6)
No recommendation	14% (4)

TABLE 15 – CHANGING EO TRAINING REQUIREMENTS

Participant responses to questions on average suggest medium range support for the program with minor changes recommended. This outcome contrast with the participant's write-in comments, which suggest more participants are in favor of eliminating current EO training requirements.

Comments on EO training program	Item
Combine EO, CO2, & POSH training to eliminate redundancy	Changes
Commander is key to successful EO program	No Change
Need more senior leader involvement in EO training program instead of just paying lip service to the program	More Leader Involvement
Maintain current quarterly EO training requirements	No Change
Establish full time authorized EO positions at CO level and above	Changes
Reduce EO training requirements from quarterly to annually	Changes
Leaders need more training on the impact of negative/positive command climates	Changes
Increase currency of CO2 training	Changes
Racially integrated chain of command is key to an effective EO program	
Eliminate entire Army EO program ** Negative impact on unit and waste of time ** Program to proscriptive – “if we put as much time in marksmanship as we do into imagined EO problems, we’d be a more deadly army than we are.” ** Bin Laden is laughing at us now – “I train men to win wars not to hold hands and be nice”	Eliminate Army EO Program

TABLE 16 – WRITE-IN COMMENTS

SURVEY CONCLUSIONS:

The twenty-nine participants in this survey paint a clear picture of what I believe to be representative of senior leaders throughout our Army regarding the EO training program. Although they answered most of the questions regarding EO training in a positive manner, the participants provided conflicting data. The written comments provided at the end of the survey indicate a lack of understanding of the current EO program, disgruntlement toward the entire program, and feelings that many senior leaders only pay lip service to the EO program. A small percentage of participants indicated that the program is great and should be maintained as is in its current state. There is also support for the complete elimination of current required EO unit level training.

Survey participant comments are in-line with my personal experience working as a Division level Equal Opportunity Advisor, providing advice to the Commanding General in the field. Many senior leaders go through the motions of supporting the EO program and 'checking the box' for EO training because it is the politically correct thing to do. In actuality, they do not believe in the benefits of the program and believe that mandatory unit training requirements should be eliminated.

PERSONAL EXPERIENCE AS A DIVISION EO ADVISOR:

Recently, I completed an assignment as a Division level EO Program Manager, for one of the premier Divisions in our Army. In this position I was responsible for managing, advising and implementing the commanding general's EO program. My experience provided me with an up close and personal view of the Army EO program in its true form at Division level to include some flaws in the program as it presently exists. I will briefly discuss some of those problems from my perspective and experience.

First, EO training in units is not being done to standard. Our Army requires company level commanders to conduct approximately four hours of mandatory EO training per company-size unit quarterly. Reviewing AR 350-1, 'Unit Training', units have in excess of 125 mandatory subjects in which to conduct training. With the high operations tempo (OPTEMPO) in division size units, commanders are forced to make choices at each level of command, based on what they have time to accomplish. Unfortunately, EO training is one of the topics' that is easily and often dropped from the schedule when deciding on priorities. This point was validated in the 1999 Department of Army EO climate survey. The survey indicated that most soldiers stated EO training in their units was either not done, often cancelled or was ineffective when accomplished with very few senior leaders (E7 and above) attending.³⁴

Second, the Army EO program is not meeting the current needs of the force through the current training paradigm. Since 1984, all service schools are required to conduct EO training for all attending resident courses (Primary Leadership Development Course, Basic Non-commissioned Officer Course, Advance Non-commissioned Officer Course, Sergeant Major's Academy, Officer Basic Course, Officer Career Course, Combined Arms Staff School, Command & General Staff, and Army War College). Reviewing the core curriculum of the service schools that are teaching EO, the primary curriculum teaches "what the Army EO program is" and "roles and responsibilities of leaders".³⁵ This training curriculum is neglecting the critical "socialization process" which examines why individuals, think and act in certain ways. This is a crucial piece in the EO training process as it gets to the "why" and "how" instead of just "what". Adding this part of EO training to all courses would send graduates from service schools back to units with a clear understanding of what the Army EO program is and enhance their understanding of why they individually think and feel in certain ways regarding race and other cultural issues. This type of training focus better prepares leaders to meet the challenges of our diverse organizations.

Third, Army leaders at brigade level and above are not being held accountable for failure to meet the intent of the Army EO program. The Army has nice regulations on paper that outline responsibilities for staff agencies governing the Army EO program and for commanders to adhere to, but I firmly believe that "no one is watching the hen house." Commanders at all levels submit reports on the progress they are making with their EO programs. Some commanders are further along than others, but some are doing virtually nothing toward advancing their EO program or meeting requirements. In most cases, commanders are not being challenged for not meeting training and other related EO requirements at Brigade, Division, Corps, or MACOM. Little or no feedback comes from higher HQs when less than adequate progress reports are submitted. What if anything can be done about these shortcomings that have been identified to better prepare our force for the 21st century and beyond?

ARMY EO TRAINING PROGRAM ASSESSMENT CONCLUSIONS:

The review of Department of the Army (DA) EO Organization Structure; Department of Defense Inspector General (DODIG) Report; Army Training and Leader Development Panel (ATLDP), Officer Study Final Report; U.S. Army War College EO Survey, Class of 2002; and personal experience serving as a Division Equal Opportunity Advisor in one of our Army's premiere Divisions, provided me with the necessary data to conduct a fair assessment of the

Army's current EO training program. The picture painted of the current Army EO training program is very clear and in my assessment, cannot be disputed. The data indicates that:

- 1) The current organizational structure of the Army EO hierarchy is ineffective and non-responsive to constantly changing requirements in the field. Training and leader development should rest with a single proponent on the DA staff to synchronize policy and resources.
- 2) The DODIG found that less than 50 percent of Army service members surveyed are receiving mandatory training on the DOD homosexual conduct policy. Army EO training and sexual harassment training are linked therefore it is extremely likely that at minimum this same percent Army personnel are not receiving related mandatory EO training as well.
- 3) The ATLDP concluded that current training and leadership development models are not effective for the 21st century and beyond; a single DA Staff element proponent must have the responsibility for developing effective training and leader development programs; all non-mission-related compliance training (EO training) must be eliminated in order to reduce unit operational pace; and leaders must be involved in and present at training to maximize benefits to the unit.
- 4) The Army War College Survey of class 2002 on the Army EO training program indicated that there is not wide support for the current EO training program. EO training is normally the first area looked to for cuts to make more time in unit schedules and most battalion and brigade level commanders spent little time being involved in their units EO training program. Most agree that mandatory EO training should be eliminated.
- 5) My personal experiences as a Division Level EO Advisor also indicate that there is little support for the current Army EO mandatory training program and that most senior leaders believe that this program is no longer needed in its present configuration. The program is seen more as the politically correct thing to do rather than genuine leader buy-in for support of the program.

So, where do we go from here in developing a more effective EO training program that will assist in meeting leader development needs of our Army for the 21st Century and beyond?

THE FUTURE ARMY EO TRAINING PROGRAM

In order for the Army EO training program to continue to be a viable tool in assisting our Army in developing leaders which are self-aware, adaptable, are continuous learners, and have the correct set of interpersonal skills, some changes are required.

First, reviewing the Army Leader Development Program, the ATLDP identified a major disconnect between training and leader development, policy and resources. These disconnect stems from the lack of having a single Department of Army proponent responsible for training and leader development. This inefficiency must be address and a single DA proponent must be designated with the responsibility and funding authority for training and leader development programs within the Army.³⁶

Second, we must move away from the mandated EO training requirement at unit level. As previously stated, most units are not accomplishing this training and see the requirement as a negative rather than a positive way to increase unit cohesion and readiness. FM 22-100, Army Leadership, dated July 1999, clearly states that EO is a function of command and leadership. The Army needs to embrace and practice this concept by allowing leaders to take full responsibility for their EO programs and holding them accountable versus having regimented requirements that are being neither adhered to nor being enforced. Additionally, the ATLDP recommended that this type of compliance training (EO training) be eliminated in an effort to reduce the overall operational pace of units.

Third, the Army must focus on developing a quality service school (NCO and officer) EO/human dynamics training curriculum. This new training paradigm requires a shift from just "what the EO program is" to focusing on the "socialization process" and its impact on each of us individually. This curriculum should be at minimum, eighty hours in duration (spread-out through course) rather than the current four to eight hour overview of the Army EO Program. This training curriculum will better develop leaders and allow them to continue to build upon what they learn at previous service school/leader development courses, "basic course through senior service college."

Fourth, the Army EO program must have buy-in from senior leaders especially at the two, three and four-star level. We need to move away from attempting to force leaders to do the right thing. We need to build a realistic coalition of support for the Army EO program, and one that not just looks good on paper. In order to do this, we must give Division Commanders the opportunity to provide input into developing the training programs at unit level. Current EO training requirements are mandated at DA Staff level with insufficient input from the field. After all, they are the key players that will make the program work and they must be the ones to

enforce the standard. It is my belief that having two, three and four-star level buy-in makes the program more viable if leaders at this level are providing candid and honest input.

CONCLUSIONS

In conclusion, the Army continues to lead our nation in providing an environment that allows all its members an equal opportunity to maximize their potential regardless of race, gender, national origin, religion, or ethnic background. The Army EO program in its over thirty-year existence has played a major contributing role to the Army's success in this area. Most changes in the EO program to this point have taken extreme amounts of time. As we move further into the information age and high technology we can no longer afford to take five or ten years to bring about major change in such a critical program. As we move into the 21st century and beyond a sense of urgency is required to refocus the Army EO training program to better develop and prepare leaders to effectively manage the increasingly diverse population of our Army. Not only will advance skill sets be required to work with our own forces but also with our Allies as we continue to build and maintain coalitions. As outlined in "Out of the Box Leadership for the 21st Century and beyond", leaders must be equipped to manage diverse workgroups. Leaders must develop multi-national leadership skills to included Trans-cultural skills, Third Culture Skills: Multi-national Creative Skills, and Personal Kaizen. These skill sets directly link to leadership skill sets identified by Lieutenant General (RET) Short and in recommendations by the ATLDP for retooling the Army Leader Development Model focusing on: Self Awareness; Adaptability; Continuous Learner; and Interpersonal Skills.

A new training paradigm/curriculum is also required in all service schools for our Army to continue to reap benefits from its EO training program in the 21st century and beyond. The curriculum must focus on individual discovery (socialization process) regarding ones beliefs on cultural issues (self awareness). Additionally, it is time to eliminate mandatory EO training requirements at unit level and to start holding commanders fully accountable for their EO programs. The ATLDP recommended the elimination of non-mission-related compliance training, as a means to help reduce unit operational pace. Revamping the Army EO training program must progress along with the Army's transformation. These words of the Army Chief of Staff are more critical and relevant than ever, as we move further into the 21st century and beyond.

. . . we, the Army's senior leadership, reaffirm our commitment to these principles and will work to ensure the equal opportunity and freedom from sexual harassment are standard in America's Army. People are the cornerstone of readiness...they must know they will be treated fairly, and with dignity and respect in all aspects of performing the mission.

. . . Leaders at all levels have an obligation to create and maintain an environment with zero tolerance for discrimination and harassment.³⁷

WORD COUNT=7561

ENDNOTES

¹ Headquarters Department of the Army. "Be, Know, DO," Army Leadership. FM 22-100. August 1999, p. 2-5.

² Samuel Huntington. The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of World Order. Simon & Schuster, 1996, pp. 1-36.

³ Ibid. pp. 38-60

⁴ U.S. Census Bureau. Www.census.gov/population/estimates/nation/intfile3-1.txt., >Internet: Accessed 13 September, 2001.

⁵ Defense Equal Opportunity Management Institute. "Demographic Trends in the Active Armed Forces & U.S. Coast Guard 1989 – 2000", Patrick AFB, FLA. 2001.

⁶ Warren Bennis; Spritzer; Micheal Grechen; and Thomas G. Cummings. The Future of Leadership. 2001, pp. 241-280

⁷ Ibid. p. 245

⁸ United States Army War College. Strategic Leadership Primer.' Department of Command, Leadership and Management, Carlisle, PA, 1998, p.42.

⁹ John Gray. 'Seminar on Diversity', Defense Equal Opportunity Management Institute, Patrick AFB, FLA, July 2000.

¹⁰ Lisa Helem. Poll: Racial Split Widens-Blacks, Whites in U.S.. See two Americas. The Atlanta Journal – Constitution, Atlanta Ga., July 11 2001

¹¹ Facts.com. '1949 Armed Forces: Race Equality Ordered, From the Archives (1940-1979)', The Presidency: Racial Bias; July 1948.

¹² Department of the Army. 'History of the Army's Equal Opportunity Program,' DAPE HR-L, Washington DC. 1995.

¹³ BG Dennis Kerr. Response to General Accounting Office Request for Reports and Studies—Final Report. Information Memorandum, Washington DC. 1994.

¹⁴ Headquarters Department of the Army. Army Command Policy. Washington, DC, July 1999, Chapter 6, pp. 72-81.

¹⁵ Army Chief of Staff. Army Training and Leader Development Panel, OS 76 Proponency, Washington DC, October 2000, p. OS-17.

¹⁶ Ibid. p. OS-18

¹⁷ Department of Defense. Military Environment With Respect To The Homosexuality Conduct Policy, Report No. D-2000-101, Office of the Inspector General, March 16, 2000. p. 27.

¹⁸ Ibid. p. 2.

¹⁹ Ibid. p. 16.

²⁰ Ibid. p. 17

²¹ 101st Airborne Division (Air Assault), Equal Opportunity Office. Army Values Education Program, May 2000, pp. 1-2.

²² U.S. Army War College. Equal Opportunity Training Survey, Class 2002, Carlisle, PA, November 2000, pp. 11-13.

²³ Ibid. Army Training and Leader Development Panel, October 2000, p. OS-1.

²⁴ Ibid. pp. OS-2-4.

²⁵ Ibid. p. OS-17.

²⁶ Ibid. pp. OS-17-18.

²⁷ Ibid. p. OS-10

²⁸ Ibid. p. OS-20.

²⁹ Ibid. p. OS-21.

³⁰ Ibid. p. OS-21.

³¹ Ibid. p. OS-4.

³² Ibid. U.S. Army War College Equal Opportunity Training Survey, p. 12.

³³ Ibid. p. 8

³⁴ Ibid. Department of Army Command Climate Survey, July 1999.

³⁵ U.S. Army Training and Doctrine Command. Common Core Curriculum, <http://www.atsc.army.mil/dld/comcor/ss80105.htm>, > Internet: Accessed 14 October 2001.

³⁶ Ibid. Army Training and Leader Development Panel, OS 76 Proponency, October 2000, p. OS-17.

³⁷ Ibid. Army Leadership.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Army Chief of Staff. Be, Know, Do, Army Leadership, FM 22-100, Washington, D.C., August 1999.
- Army Chief of Staff. Army Training and Leader Development Panel, OS 76 Proponency, Washington, D.C., October 2000
- Bennis, Warren; Spritzer; Grechen M.; and Cummings, Thomas G. The Future of Leadership. 2001.
- Defense Equal Opportunity Management Institute. Demographic Trends in the Active Armed Forces & U.S. Coast Guard 1989 – 2000, Directorate of Research, Patrick AFB, FLA. 2001.
- Department of The Army. History of the Army's Equal Opportunity Program, DAPE HR-L, Washington, D.C., 1995.
- Department of the Army. Army Command Climate Survey, Washington, D.C., 1999.
- Department of Defense Inspector General. Military Environment With Respect To The Homosexuality Conduct Policy, Report No. D-2000-101, 2000.
- Facts.com. 1949 Armed Forces: Race Equality Ordered, From the Archives (1940-1979), The Presidency: Racial Bias; July 1948.
- Fort Campbell Kentucky. 101st Airborne Division (Air Assault), Equal Opportunity Office. Eagle Values Education Program, Fort Campbell Ky., 2000.
- Gray, John. Seminar on Diversity. Defense Equal Opportunity Management Institute, Patrick AFB, July 2000.
- Headquarters Department of the Army. Army Command Policy, Washington, D.C., July 1999.
- Helem, Lisa. Poll: Racial Split Widens-Blacks, Whites in U.S., See two Americas, The Atlanta Journal – Constitution, Atlanta Ga., July 11 2001.
- Huntington, Samuel. The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of World Order. Simon & Schuster, 1996.
- Kerr, Dennis BG. "Response to General Accounting Office Request for Reports and Studies—Final Report," Information Memorandum, Washington D.C., 1994.
- Training and Doctrine Command. Common Core Curriculum, <http://www.atsc.army.mil/dld/comcor/ss80105.htm>. >Internet Accessed 13 October 2001
- U.S. Army War College. Equal Opportunity Training Survey, Class 2002, Carlisle, PA, 2001.
- U.S. Army War College. Strategic Leadership Primer. Department of Command, Leadership and Management, United States Army War College, 1998.
- U.S. Census Bureau. www.census.gov/population/estimates/nation/intfile3-1.txt., 2000.