MEMORANDUM FOR RECORD

SUBJECT: The Army Character Development Project Team, 1st FY18 Meeting (Telecon), 11 October (1500-1600 EDT)

1. References


   c. Meeting Slides, Character Development Project Team Telecon, 11 Oct 17 (Encl 1).

   d. Supplementary (post telecon) Comments/Discussion (Encl 2).

2. Purpose. To summarize the information presented and discussions during the subject meeting. The agenda included the status of the Army Character Development Project, focusing on guidance received in APLDF 17-4 (ref 1. a.) and initial planning for implementation of The Army’s Framework for Character Development (ref 1.b.). (see Slide 2, ref 1.c.) Participants from 64 locations representing approximately 40 organizations from across the Army and academia joined the telecon.

3. Background.


   b. Accordingly, APLDF initiative, I-14-007, was extended and amended as FY18, APL #2P, "The Army's Framework for Character Development – Implementation and Assessment."

   c. The intent is to design, staff, and gain approval for a comprehensive plan to implement and assess The Army’s Framework for Character Development in support of the Army Leader Development Strategy (ALDS).
d. CAPE will continue to serve, on behalf of CG, CAC for implementation and assessment planning, by leading the Army Character Development Project Team, including all member organizations of the APLDF and the HD community of practice.

4. Agenda and Discussion.

a. *The Army’s Framework for Character Development* is the ALDS implemented in accordance with the Army Ethic. The ALDS is based on seven imperatives that synchronize and implement Army Profession, mission command, and leadership doctrine. The prescriptive components of the framework recognize the imperatives of an Army culture of trust, professional climates within Army organizations, and individual responsibility to embrace and live our shared identity as *Trusted Army Professionals*.

b. Within the ALDS, character development integrated within all developmental activities is a continuous process, through education, training, and experience, that strengthens the resolve of *Trusted Army Professionals* to live by and uphold the Army Ethic, to include the Army Values, as demonstrated in our decisions and actions.

c. The implementation and assessment plan envisions three complementary lines of effort, supporting objectives and tasks, and four sequential phases, beginning in FY 18. (See Slide 7, ref 1.c.). The plan will be refined and presented for conceptual approval at APLDF 18-1 on 16 Nov 17. Further refinements will be formally staffed and presented at subsequent APLDFs

d. The ASA (M&RA) will be asked to charter a working group with the mission to propose Army-wide synchronized policy guidance regarding: our shared identity, certification, climate, and assessment.

1) The role of our shared identity, supporting character development, is recognized as central to achieving the end state (See Slide 9, ref 1.c.).

2) Certification of *Trusted Army Professionals* must be properly defined, understood, practiced, and documented throughout the Army.

3) Organizational climate must be operationally defined, taught consistently at all levels of PME/CES, and holistically assessed, enabling organizational leaders to create, strengthen, evaluate, and make appropriate adjustments to the climate within their organizations.

4) Assessment of the success of the framework in achieving its end-state requires a comprehensive process to be developed within the initial phase of the implementation plan and tested in subsequent phases, leading to full operational capability.
e. Within each line of effort, the Offices of Primary Responsibility (OPRs) and Offices of Coordinating Responsibility (OCRs) are proposed along with the DOTMLPF-P solution addressed in achieving the objective. It is important that we identify the POC for each organization to represent the perspective of the Senior Responsible Officer, ensuring proper coordination and consensus as the implementation plan matures.

f. In preparing this MFR, a draft was coordinated with participants along with an invitation for all to provide any additional comments or insights that they were not able to introduce during the telecon. These are included for information, without attribution, in Supplementary Comments at Encl 2.

5. Milestones and Decision Points:

1) Refine *The Army’s Framework for Character Development “Implementation and Assessment Plan”* and present it for concept approval at APLDF 18-1, 16 Nov 17.

2) Socialize the plan with strategic Army leaders at the Army Profession Forum, 6 Dec 17.

3) Formally staff and gain approval for the plan, NLT 4th QTR FY 18.

Encls
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Purpose:
To review the status of the Character Development Project and discuss the emerging implementation and assessment plan for The Army’s Framework for Character Development.

Agenda:

- Introduction
- Terms of Reference
- Background
- The Army’s Framework for Character Development
- Implementation Planning
  - LOEs & Time Phases for Implementation
  - Supporting Objectives and Tasks
- Next Steps
Character

• **Intrinsically** – One’s true nature, including identity, sense of purpose, values, virtues, morals, and conscience. (ADRP 1, para 5-14; FM 6-22, para 5-2)

• **Operationally** – Dedication and adherence to the Army Ethic, including Army Values, as consistently and faithfully demonstrated in decisions and actions. (ADRP1, para 5-14; FM 6-22, para 5-2)

**Character Development**

The continuous process—within the Army as an Institution and Army Organizations, through education, training, and experience—that strengthens the resolve of *Trusted Army Professionals* to live by and uphold the Army Ethic, including Army Values, as consistently and faithfully demonstrated in decisions and actions.
Army Character Development Project

2011, Army Profession Campaign – Army lacks doctrine on the Army Profession
2012, ADP 1, Chapter 2, *The Army Profession*
2013, ADRP 1, *The Army Profession*, including a framework for the Army Ethic
2014, APLDF FY 15, Initiative I-14-007, APL 4P (Create a Concept, Strategy, Doctrine for Character Development)
  APLDF FY 16, Initiative I-14-007, APL 3P (Create a Concept, Strategy, Doctrine for Character Development); CNA GAP 501028
HQDA EXORD 086-16, HUMAN DIMENSION, Army Profession – Cross-Cutting Concept
  APLDF FY 17, Initiative I-14-007, APL 3P (Army Character Development Project)
  APLDF FY18, Initiative I-14-007, APL 2P, Army Character Development Framework, Implementation & Assessment
The Army Ethic
The Heart of the Army

This We’ll Defend.

Living the Army Ethic inspires our shared identity as trusted Army professionals with distinctive roles as honorable servants, Army experts, and stewards of the profession. To honor these obligations we adopt, live by, and uphold the moral principles of the Army Ethic. Beginning with our solemn oath of service as defenders of the Nation, we voluntarily incur the extraordinary moral obligation to be trusted Army professionals.

Trusted Army Professionals are

Honorable Servants of the Nation—Professionals of Character:

We serve honorably—according to the Army Ethic—under civilian authority while obeying the laws of the Nation and all legal orders; further, we reject and report illegal, unethical, or immoral orders or actions.

We take pride in honorably serving the Nation with integrity, demonstrating character in all aspects of our lives.

In war and peace, we recognize the intrinsic dignity and worth of all people, treating them with respect.

We lead by example and demonstrate courage by doing what is right despite risk, uncertainty, and fear; we candidly express our professional judgment to subordinates, peers, and superiors.

Army Experts—Competent Professionals:

We do our duty, leading and following with discipline, striving for excellence, putting the needs of others above our own, and accomplishing the mission as a team.

We accomplish the mission and understand it may demand courageously risking our lives and justly taking the lives of others.

We continuously advance the expertise of our chosen profession through life-long learning, professional development, and our certifications.

Stewards of the Army Profession—Committed Professionals:

We embrace and uphold the Army Values and standards of the profession, always accountable to each other and the American people for our decisions and actions.

We wisely use the resources entrusted to us, ensuring our Army is well led and well prepared, while caring for Soldiers, Army Civilians, and Families.

We continuously strengthen the essential characteristics of the Army Profession, reinforcing our bond of trust with each other and the American people.
ENDSTATE: The Army Leader Development Strategy is implemented in accordance with the Army Ethic, providing the Nation an Army of trusted professionals of character, competence, and commitment who are inspired to honorably fulfill their Oaths of Service.

The ALDS and the Army Ethic apply to the Army as an institution, guide all Army organizations, and support the development of trusted Army professionals across the Total Force. Leader responsibilities include reinforcing an Army culture of trust, creating and sustaining professional climates within Army organizations, and adopting and strengthening our shared identity as trusted Army professionals. In this light, the responsibilities at each level of leadership are mutually supporting and interdependent. Leaders at all levels influence and are influenced by the Army culture, their organization, and living our shared identity. All Army leaders must acknowledge and accept their inherent responsibility to develop character within themselves and others.
LOE 1: Strategic Leaders

*Army Culture of Trust*

LOE 2: Organizational Leaders

*Professional Organizational Climate*

LOE 3: Direct Leaders

*Trusted Army Professionals*

**Objective**

- Policies, Programs, Systems, -Strengthen-
  Army Culture of Trust

**End-State**

- Army Leader Development Strategy is implemented IAW
- The Army Ethic, providing the Nation an Army of Trusted Professionals of character, competence, and commitment who are inspired to honorably fulfill their Oaths of Service

**Framework For Character Development Implementation Plan**

- **PHASE I:** Design and Staging
- **PHASE II:** Initial Ops
- **PHASE III:** Continuing Ops
- **PHASE IV:** FOC

**LOE 1**

- FY2018: PHASE I: Design and Staging
- FY2019: PHASE II: Initial Ops
- FY2020: PHASE III: Continuing Ops
- FY2021: PHASE IV: FOC
- FY2022: Assessment
FY 18: Phase I – Design and Staging
• Develop, Staff, and Gain Approval for the Implementation and Assessment Plan for the Army’s Framework for Character Development
  o Identify Partners for Implementation of Initiatives (e.g., SO 1.3)
  o Establish Working Groups for SO 2.1 (Climate), SO 2.3 (Certification), SO 3.1 (Identity), SO 4.1 (Assessment)
• Provide IPRs (MOP)/Extend the APLDF Initiative into FY 19

FY 19: Phase II – Initial Operations
• Army Publications, Synchronization Continues
• PME/CES, Tng, Opns Integrate Ethical Reasoning/Challenges
• Integrate Best Practices in Instructor preparation & certification (e.g., ASLTE, GVV, First Tee, Covey)
• Provide IPRs (MOP)/Extend the APLDF Initiative into FY 20

FY 20: Phase III – Continuing Operations
• Continuation of planned implementation
• Initial assessment of success (MOE)/Close the APLDF initiative

FY 21: Phase IV – Full Operations with continuing assessment
Supporting Objective 1.1: Ensure strategic leader influence on the Army culture of trust is understood beginning at intermediate levels of PME/CES and reinforced at senior levels of learning.

**Task 1.1.1:** TRADOC (CAC) and USAWC integrate ethical considerations within strategic thinking to include understanding of strategic responsibility for character development and the impact of current directives, policies, programs, and systems on the culture of trust.

**Task 1.1.2:** TRADOC (CAC) and USAWC introduce application of the Army Ethic within strategic thinking in intermediate PME/CES for all cohorts and reinforce at senior levels.

[Leadership & Education]

Note: Tasks highlighted in Green are within the AR 5-22, AR 600-20, AR 600-100 responsibilities of CG, CAC
Supporting Objective 1.2: Ensure future directives, policies, concepts, doctrine, and strategic communications support an Army culture of trust and enable mission command at all levels of leadership.

Task 1.2.1: ASA (M&RA) and TRADOC align leadership directives, policies, and concepts and doctrine with The Army’s Framework for Character Development.

Task 1.2.2: TRADOC ensures the synchronized policies and doctrine are taught in PME/CES.

[Doctrine, Leadership & Education, Policy]
Supporting Objective 1.3: Ensure strategic messaging represents the Army as a trusted military profession and Soldiers and Army Civilians as trusted Army professionals, answering a calling to honorable service.

Task 1.3.1: ASA (M&RA), in coordination with OCPA and TRADOC (USAREC), develops strategic messaging and assesses its resonance with the American people and its effectiveness in support of recruiting.

Task 1.3.2: HQDA DCS G-1 and TRADOC (USAREC) coordinate with USMEPCOM (U.S. Military Entrance Processing Command) to ensure consistency between the strategic message and the professional climate, supporting a seamless transition to CIMT (Center for Initial Military Training).

[Leadership & Education, Policy]
Supporting Objective 1.4: Army recruiter selection, preparation, and certification reinforces the strategic message and the responsibility to inspire and motivate individuals to join the Army as a calling to honorable service.

Task 1.4.1: HQDA DCS G-1 and TRADOC (USAREC) assess current policies, guidance, and procedures regarding selection and certification of recruiters.

Task 1.4.2: HQDA DCS G-1 and TRADOC (USAREC) ensure professional development of recruiters supports the intent to inspire and motivate candidates to accept a calling to serve in the Army Profession.

[Leadership & Education, Policy]
Supporting Objective 2.1: Ensure leaders know why and how to establish professional organizational climates and have the resources to assess climate and adjust, as necessary.

Task 2.1.1: ASA (M&RA) assigns proponency for professional organizational climate to CG TRADOC (CAC).

Task 2.1.2: ASA (M&RA) charters an Army Project Team to align Army Command policy and Army Profession and Leadership policy, leadership/leader doctrine, and associated practices and procedures with The Army’s Framework for Character Development.

Task 2.1.3: TRADOC develops an assessment methodology based on the operational definition of professional organizational climate in The Army’s Framework for Character Development.

Task 2.1.4: TRADOC integrates instruction within PME/CES regarding the nature and importance of professional organizational climates, including why and how to establish, strengthen, assess, and adjust.

[Doctrine, Leadership & Education, Policy]
Supporting Objective 2.2: Ensure ethical challenges are integrated within PME/CES, organizational training, experiential activities, and exercises to include ethical considerations in decision making, planning, rehearsals, execution, and after action reviews.

Task 2.2.1: TRADOC revises doctrine on MDMP, Troop Leading Procedures, and military problem solving to include the essentiality of ethical reasoning within military decision making, planning, rehearsals, operations, and assessment.

Task 2.2.2: TRADOC develops and certifies organizational leaders of schools, curriculum developers, and instructors to ensure ethical reasoning, supporting character development, is integrated within curricula, instruction, and assessment.

Task 2.2.3: FORSCOM incorporates ethical challenges into mission profiles in Home Station training, CTCs, JRX, and all other simulated training.

Task 2.2.4: FORSCOM prepares and certifies observer/controllers to assess and review organizational performance in preparing for and addressing ethical challenges within conduct of the training mission.

[Doctrine, Training, Leadership & Education, Policy]
Supporting Objective 2.3: Ensure each certification event (e.g., performance evaluation, graduation or completion of training, promotion, reenlistment, assumption of command, change of responsibility, etc.) confirms that the certifying authority has verified and validated that the individual has demonstrated character, competence, and commitment to performance standards.

Task 2.3.1: The Sec Army assigns proponency for Army Professional Certification to ASA (M&RA).

Task 2.3.2: ASA (M&RA) charters an Army Project Team to operationally define Army Professional Certification consistent with doctrine of the Army Profession (ADRP 1).

Task 2.3.3: ASA (M&RA) directs alignment of Army policy and procedures regarding Army professional certification.

Task 2.3.4: Organizational leaders ensure that Army professional certification policies and procedures are implemented to standard and certification becomes a permanent entry on personnel records.

[Training, Leadership & Education, Personnel, Policy]
Supporting Objective 3.1: Ensure leaders are taught why and how to inspire and motivate Soldiers and Army Civilians to embrace our shared identity and commit to self-development, lifelong learning, and the concept of Soldier for Life.

Task 3.1.1: ASA (M&RA) charters an Army Project Team to revise Army training and leader development policy and doctrine to address why and how to inspire and motivate individuals to embrace and live our shared identity as trusted Army professionals.

Task 3.1.2: TRADOC revises Army training and leader development doctrine to emphasize that self-development includes study and consideration of ethical challenges and how they may be anticipated and avoided in performance of duty.

Task 3.1.3: TRADOC and FORSCOM ensure the policy and doctrine of strengthening our identity is taught in IMT and PME/CES; reinforced through coaching, counseling, and mentoring; and included in individual development plans.

[Doctrine, Training, Leadership & Education, and Policy]
Supporting Objective 4.1: ASA (M&RA) & TRADOC develop and implement a character development assessment process* to determine the degree to which The Army’s Framework for Character Development is having the intended effect.

Task 4.1.1: Continuously review and affirm or adjust The Army’s Framework for Character Development to ensure it reflects current, reliable, and valid concepts for character development.

Task 4.1.2: Assess institutional policies, programs, systems, etc., to determine if they support an Army Culture of Trust.

Task 4.1.3: Evaluate the state of professional organization climates to ensure they reflect the principles of the Army Ethic and mission command.

Task 4.1.4: Evaluate the decisions and actions of Soldiers and Army Civilians to determine if they are consistent with the Army Ethic in the exercise of mission command.

*Assessment addresses all levels of leadership: strategic (the Army Institution and culture of trust), organizational (professional climate), and direct (identity). The assessment will evaluate cohesive teamwork and mutual trust within the Army and trust with the American people.

[Policy—requires authority of ASA(M&RA) to coordinate and integrate the effort => Project Team]
Next Steps

06 Oct 17: Brief Dir, MCCoE on Army Character Development Implementation Plan

11 Oct 17: ACDP Team Telecon Meeting

01 Nov 17: ACDP Slide Presentation submitted to MCCoE

16 Nov 17: Present the emerging plan for approval of LOE, Time-Phasing, and Supporting Objectives and Tasks at APLDF 18-1

06 Dec 17: Socialize the plan with Strategic Leaders at the Army Profession Forum

Mid-Dec: Distribute Author’s DRAFT Implementation Plan to ACDP Team

APLDF 18-2: IPR and Initial DRAFT Implementation Plan

APLDF 18-3: IPR and Final DRAFT Implementation Plan

APLDF 18-4: IPR and Signature DRAFT Implementation Plan
The Army Character Development Project

- FY 14-15: CNA GAP 501028: Army Lacks a Consensus for Character Development.
- FY 16-17: APLDF I-14-007: Army-wide Project Team: Solve the Problem. Approved White Paper Army’s Framework for CD.
- FY 18: Continue APLDF I-14-007: Implement the Solution.

Trust: Essential for Mission Command

- Mission Command
  - Trusted Army Professionals
  - Trust: Army Professional
  - Army Expert
    - Performance of Duty: with Discipline & to Standard

Character
- Dedication to the Army Ethic: Demonstrated in Decisions & Actions
- Honorable Service & Mission Accomplishment: Despite Adversity, Obstacles, & Challenges

Live by & Uphold the Army Ethic

Cape.army.mil
• Doctrine of the Army Profession
• Articulation of the Army Ethic
• Certification of Trusted Army Professionals
  o Character → Decisions & Actions
  o Competence → Duty: Discipline & Standards
  o Commitment → Resolve & Resilience

• Mission Command → Mutual Trust & Cohesion
• Mutual Trust → Leaders-Followers: Character, Competence, & Commitment
• ALDS → Leader Development: Education, Training, & Experience

Character
Must Be Developed Within
Leader Development
**Implementation Initiatives**

**Line of Effort #1**

The Army as an Institution – **Culture of Trust** – Strategic Leaders
- Strategic Leader Influence
- Review & Synchronization of Policy, Programs, & Systems
- Strategic Messaging -> Recruiting

**Line of Effort #2**

Army Organizations – **Professional Organizational Climates** – Organizational Leaders
- Leader Training: why-how-assess-adjust
- Organization Training -> Ethical Challenges
- Certification

**Line of Effort #3**

Soldiers and Army Civilians – **Identity** – Direct Leaders & Followers
- Embrace Shared Identity as *Trusted Army Professionals*
- Self-Development

**Assessment: Current Theory, Consistent Design, Implementation, Outcomes**
The Army’s Framework for Character Development

**Framework**
- Army Culture of Trust
- Professional Organizational Climate
- Trusted Army Professionals

**Guidance**
- Policies, Regulations, Doctrine, Procedures
- Army Leader Development Strategy
- Army Ethic
- Certification

**Education, Training, Experience**
- Army Schools PME/CES/Tng
- Combat Training Centers
- Joint Readiness Exercises
- Leaders: Strategic Organizational Direct
- Assessment

**Practice**
- Mission Command Philosophy & Doctrine
- Duty Discipline & Standards (c,c,c)
- Leadership Inspiration-Motivation (c,c,m)
- Decisions & Actions (e,e,e)

**Outcome**
- Mutual Trust & Cohesive Teamwork
- Personal & Unit Mission Readiness
- Ethical Application of Landpower
- Trust American People

Army Leader Development Strategy + The Army Ethic
ARMY CULTURE OF TRUST

Initiative 1: Strategic leader influence on the Army culture of trust should be taught beginning at intermediate levels of PME/CES and reinforced at the senior levels of learning. This will develop a strategic mindset, supporting understanding of the effects of strategic decisions at all levels of leadership. Leadership & Education.

Initiative 2: Review and ensure that directives, policies, regulations, concepts, doctrine, and strategic communications addressing character are in accordance with Army Profession doctrine (ADRP 1). This includes synchronization of Army Profession and Army Leadership doctrine and redressing policy or practices that may undermine trust (e.g., programs or systems that create situational dilemmas wherein we may be “lying to ourselves”). Doctrine, Leadership & Education, Policy.

Initiative 3: Develop and promulgate strategic messaging for the Army as a trusted military profession and Soldiers and Army Civilians as trusted Army professionals, answering a calling to honorable service. Simultaneously, Army recruiter preparation and certification addresses the responsibility to inspire and motivate individuals to join the Army as a calling to honorable service. Leadership & Education, Policy.
PROFESSIONAL ORGANIZATIONAL CLIMATE

**Initiative 4**: Leaders should be taught why and how to establish and assess the professional climate within their organizations. Organizational leaders should be provided with resources to assess and redress conditions within the unit or organization that fail to meet professional standards. *Doctrine, Leadership & Education.*

**Initiative 5**: During PME/CES and organizational training, ethical challenges are integrated within experiential activities and exercises to ensure their consideration in decisionmaking, planning, rehearsals, execution, and in after action reviews. *Doctrine, Training, Leadership & Education, Policy.*

**Initiative 6**: Each certification event (e.g., performance evaluation, graduation or completion of training, promotion, reenlistment, assumption of command, change of responsibility, etc.) should confirm that the certifying authority has verified and validated that the individual has demonstrated character, competence, and commitment to performance standards. Certification should be made a permanent entry on personnel records. *Training, Leadership & Education, Policy.*
IDENTITY—DIRECT LEADERS

**Initiative 7**: Army leaders acknowledge and accept their responsibility to develop character in themselves and others. Leaders are taught why and how to inspire and motivate Soldiers and Army Civilians to embrace our shared identity and commit to self-development, lifelong learning, and the concept of Soldier for Life. Coaching, counseling, and mentoring include ethical considerations in decisions and actions. *Doctrine, Training, Leadership & Education, Policy.*

**ASSESSMENT**

**Initiative 8**: Develop and implement a character development assessment process to determine the degree to which *The Army’s Framework for Character Development* is having the intended effect. Assessment addresses all levels of leadership: strategic (the Army Institution and culture of trust), organizational (professional climate), and direct (identity). The assessment will evaluate cohesive teamwork and mutual trust within the Army and trust with the American people. *Policy.*
As directed by CSA, ACPME Established at USMA (MAY 08)

**2008**

- Army Center for Professional Military Ethic (ACPME)

**2009**

- ACPME conducts research and literature review
  - AR 5-22 designates USMA SUPT as proponent for Profession & Military Ethic (PME) (6 MAR 09)
  - Strategic Studies Institute / ACPME PME Monograph Series begins (OCT 09)
  - Begins Private/Public Universities Collaborations

**FY09**

- **FY09**
  - Profession of Arms Pamphlet (OCT 10)
  - Army White Paper “Profession of Arms” (8 DEC 10)
  - AUSA (OCT 10)

**FY10**

- Initiates Army Profession and Ethic Training (APET)/Master APET (MAPET)
  - CGSC Ethics Symposium (NOV 10)
  - SEC Army TOR assigns Army Profession Campaign to TRADOC with CAPE leading to review the Army Profession in an era of persistent conflict (27 OCT 10)

**FY10**

- ACPME designated CAPE and aligned under CAC, TRADOC (1 OCT 10)
CAFE Time-Line

US Army Combined Arms Center
SOLDIERS AND LEADERS - OUR ASYMMETRIC ADVANTAGE

Secretary of the Army
Hon. John McHugh

CSA
Dempsey
GEN Raymond T. Odierno

SMA
SMA Raymond F. Chandler

CG, TRADOC
GEN Robert W. Cone

CG, CAC
LTG Robert L. Caslen
LTG David G. Perkins

Director, LD&E
BG Sean McFarland

Director
COL Sean Hannah

Deputy Director
LTG William Speier

Deputy Director
CH (LTC) Mark Fairbrother

Senior Enlisted Advisor
COL John Vermeesch

Director, MCCoE
BG James

Director, MCCoE
MG Skip Davis

Director, MCCoE
Director, MCCoE

DGAP

2011
FY12
FY13
FY14

Army Profession Campaign

Implementation of Army Profession Strengthening Initiatives (APSI)

• AP Campaign Report (APR 12)
• ADP 1, Ch 2 “The Army Profession” (SEP 12)

• CSA initiated APC w/ Unified Quest (UQ) (JAN 11)
• Jr. Ldr. Forum concludes APC assessment (NOV 11)

• CSA Guiding Questions
  ➢ What makes us a profession?
  ➢ What makes us professionals?
  ➢ What has nine years of persistent conflict done to the profession?

2012

2013

2014

America’s Army – Our Profession

Army Ethic Project

CY13 AAOPE Education & Training Program
FY13 AAOPE Stand Strong

CY13 Q1 Standards & Discipline
CY13 Q2 Customs, Courtesies & Traditions
CY13 Q3 Military Expertise
CY13 Q4 FY14 Honors

• ADRP 1 (14 JUN 13)
• Begin integration of AP in PME / CES & Army Doctrine

• AUSA (OCT 12)
• AUSA (OCT 13)

• MAPET / APET discontinued (MAR 12)
• CGSC Ethics Symposium (OCT 12)

• Initiate AP Seminars
• CSA realigned under MCCoE (AUG 13)

• AP Campaign Report (APR 12)
• ADP 1, Ch 2 “The Army Profession” (SEP 12)

• AUSA (OCT 12)
• CGSC Ethics Symposium (OCT 12)

• Initiate AP Seminars
• CSA realigned under MCCoE (AUG 13)

• AUSA (OCT 13)

CY13 Q4 FY14 Q182

Trust
The Army Ethic Project

**FY14 AAOP Stand Strong**

- TRUST
  - Army Ethic White Paper (11 JUL 14)
  - 1st CSA Army Profession Symposium (31 JUL 14)
  - CGSC Ethics Symposium (APR 14)
  - DOTMLPF-P assessment (APR 14)
  - Human Dimension (HD) Concept (MAY 14)
  - ASA (M&RA), Human Capital Big Data Strategy (JUN 14)
  - Army Civilian Acculturation Handbook (JUN 14)

**FY 15-16 AAOP Living the Army Ethic**

- ADRP 1 revision to include the Army Ethic + e2book (JUN 15)
- CASAP FY 15 Technical Report (1 SEP 15)
- CAPE strategic plan (JUN 15)
- Junior Leader Army Profession Symposium (JLAPS) (FEB 15)
- Not In My Squad (NIMS) Initiated (JUN 15)
- Army Profession Symposium (30 JUL 15)
- Army HD Strategy (JUN 15)
- Army Vision (JUN 15)
- AR 5-22 revised assigns proponency to CAC/CAPE (OCT 15)
- AUSA (OCT 15)
- HD EXORD 08-16 (22 DEC 15)
- NCO 2020 (DEC 15)

*CAPE Mission Changes (JUN 15)*

---

**CAFE Time-Line**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Secretary of the Army</th>
<th>E. Fanning (Acting)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CSA</td>
<td>GEN Raymond T. Odierno</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMA</td>
<td>SMA Raymond F. Chandler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CG, TRADOC</td>
<td>GEN David G. Perkins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CG, CAC</td>
<td>LTG Robert B. Brown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director, MCCoE</td>
<td>BG Thomas S. James Jr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director</td>
<td>COL Denton Knapp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deputy Director</td>
<td>COL John A. Vermeesch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Enlisted Advisor</td>
<td>SGM David Stewart</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Army Character Development Project

FY 15-16 AAOP Living the Army Ethic

- Army White Paper - Developing the Character of Trusted Army Professionals, Forging the Way Ahead (19 APR 16)
- JLAPS (APR 16)
  - CPT Solarium (JUL 16)
- Soldier for Life (SFL)
- Talent Management
  - WO 2025 (MAR 16)

FY 17-18 AAOP One Army Indivisible

- Army White Paper - The Army’s Framework for Character Development (CD) (T) (AUG 17)
- AR 600-100 “Army Profession and Leadership policy” (5 APR 17)
- CASAP FY16 Technical Report (DEC 16)
- Army Profession Forum (DEC 16)
- CGSC Ethics Symposium (APR 17)
- NIMS transitions (JUL 17)
- Depicts the Army’s CD Framework
The Army’s Framework for Character Development
Implementation and Assessment
Army Character Development Project Team Meeting (Telecon)
11 October 2017
Speaker’s Notes

Slide 1 – Cover Slide:

The Army’s Framework for Character Development is the Army Leader Development Strategy (ALDS) implemented in accordance with the Army Ethic. The ALDS is based on the doctrine of the Army Profession, mission command, and leadership. The prescriptive components of the framework recognize the imperatives of an Army culture of trust, professional climates within Army organizations, and individual responsibility to embrace and live our shared identity as Trusted Army Professionals.

Slide 2 – Purpose and Agenda:

Publication of the Army White Paper “The Army’s Framework for Character Development” completes work on the APLDF FY 15-17 Initiative I-14-007. However, in APLDF 17-4, the Initiative was extended and amended to address implementation and assessment of the framework as FY 18, APL #2P (I-14-007).

Slide 3 – Terms of Reference:

Army doctrine, ADRP 1 The Army Profession, cites the intrinsic definition of character as one’s “true nature including identity, sense of purpose, values, virtues, morals, and conscience.” Army leadership doctrine, ADRP 6-22, describes character as the “moral and ethical qualities” that help us determine what is right and provide motivation to act accordingly. Specifically, in an operational context, character is “an Army professional's dedication and adherence to the Army Ethic, including Army Values, as consistently and faithfully demonstrated in decisions and actions.” (ADRP 1; FM 6-22) Professional and leader development is a lifelong continuous process, consisting of education, training, experience, and self-development. (AR 600-100, para 1-5.e.) The principles of leadership, professional development, character development, and leader development are equally applicable to Soldiers and Army Civilians. (AR 600-100, para 1-6.a.) Army professional certification is verification and validation of an Army professional’s character, competence, and commitment to fulfill responsibilities and perform assigned duties with discipline and to standard [through progressive certification, the Army strengthens trust by confirming the professional development of Soldiers and Army Civilians and the readiness of organizations]. (AR 600-100, para 1-8.a.) The Army defines professional development as the deliberate and continuous process of education, training, and experience that prepares Soldiers and Army Civilians of character, competence, and commitment to perform present and future duty in accordance with the Army Ethic. The process of professional development of Soldiers and Army Civilians prepares them for increasing levels of responsibility … A trusted Army professional must be an honorable
servant, Army expert, and steward of the profession. (AR 600-100, para 1-9.a.) Properly designed leader development programs develop trusted leaders of character, competence, and commitment. (FM 6-22, para 1-1.)

Slide 4 – Army Character Development Project:

- In April 2012, principal findings from the Army Profession Campaign included: “The Army lacked doctrine for the Army Profession.”
- Therefore, publication of ADP 1, September 2012, included a new Chapter 2, describing the characteristics of the Army Profession and establishing trust as the foundation for our relationship with the American people and with each other.
- Subsequently, for the first time, ADRP 1 (Jun 13) the Army Profession was published, expanding on the nature of the Army Profession. This edition provided a “framework for the Army Ethic.”
- The ALDS (2013) envisions “an Army of competent and committed leaders of character ….”
- In 2014 an initiative was approved in the APLDF (I-14-007) to work on a “concept, strategy, and doctrine for Character Development.”
- In 2015, the importance of this effort was confirmed by CNA GAP analysis (#501028: The Army lacks the capability to … develop character … and to assess success ….). Concurrently, a revision of ADRP 1 was published in 2015 to include an articulation of the Army Ethic. The next step to address this GAP and implement the APLDF Initiative, under authority of HQDA EXORD 086-16, CAC/MCCoE/CAPE was to establish the Army Character Development Project.
- In 2016, the Army published its White Paper, “Developing the Character of Army Professionals, Forging the Way Ahead.” This paper articulated the nature of the problem and proposed a method to solve it.
- The APLDF commissioned the next step by amending and extending I-14-007 as FY 18 APL #29 to “Implement and Assess the Army’s Framework for Character Development.”
- Planning for implementation will be accomplished by the Army Character Development Project Team and approved and managed through the APLDF.

Slide 5 – The Army Ethic:

The Army Ethic explains the nature of Honorable Service for the Army, both as an institution and as a profession. It expresses the expectation and the standard to make right decisions and to take right actions in the conduct of the mission, performance of Duty, and in all aspects of our lives. The Army Ethic explains why we conduct ourselves morally and ethically, instead of just describing the what and how of professional service. It provides motivation and inspiration for each of us to perform our Duty in a manner...
worthy of the Trust of the American people and each other. The Army Ethic emphasizes and informs Stewardship: caring for and developing subordinates, peers, and leaders in Character, Competence, and Commitment; safeguarding and maintaining property; and exercising appropriate and disciplined use of resources. The Army Ethic guides the ethical design, generation, support, and application of landpower, including regulations, policies, programs, procedures, practices, and systems. Living the Army Ethic inspires and strengthens our shared identity as Trustworthy Army Professionals, drives Character Development, and reinforces Trust among Soldiers, Army Civilians, Army Families, and with the American people.

Slide 6 – The Army’s Framework for Character Development:

The Army’s Framework for Character Development is the ALDS, implemented in accordance with the Army Ethic and synchronized at all levels of leadership: strategic, organizational, and direct. The ALDS and the Army Ethic apply to the Army as an institution, guide all Army organizations, and effect the development of trusted Army professionals across the Total Force.

Strategic leaders, through their decisions and actions, strengthen the Army Culture of Trust (ADRP 1, Appendix A). Institutional directives, policies, programs, and systems must be trusted (ethical, effective, efficient; ADRP 1, para 2-19): designed and implemented in accordance with the Army Ethic and the philosophy and doctrine of Mission Command (ADRP 6-0; TP525-3-3). For example: Human Capital Big Data Strategy, Talent Management, Army Civilian Acculturation and Engagement.

Organizational leaders of commands, centers, schools, training centers, and tactical units are guided by their organizational leaders who establish and sustain professional organizational climates where all are inspired and expected to live by and uphold the Army Ethic in the exercise of Mission Command. Organizational leaders are responsible to ensure the mission is accomplished in the right way (ethically, effectively, efficiently). Direct leaders and followers, are responsible for adopting our shared identity as trusted Army professionals. Soldiers and Army Civilians offer and accept objective, professional assessment of their performance. Effective coaching, counseling, and mentoring help leaders and followers to improve in performance of duty.


Slide 7 – Framework for Character Development, Implementation Plan

LOE 1: Strategic leaders provide for institutional education supporting military expertise. They secure resources and assign priorities for facilities and infrastructure, weapons and equipment, supply and maintenance, and manpower and funding. They establish the goals and procedures for military recruiting and civilian accessions. Their policies guide lifecycle management of all Army personnel and establish the programs that care for their
families. In this way, strategic leaders’ decisions and actions shape Army culture, and only in a culture of trust can organizational and direct leaders exercise mission command.

LOE 2: Organizational leaders recognize that accomplishing the mission requires mutual trust and cohesive teamwork. As such, they establish a professional climate where the expectation and the standard are that all will live by and uphold the Army Ethic in the exercise of mission command (recognized as the Army’s leadership philosophy).

LOE 3: As direct leaders we influence followers. At the same time, all of us are subject to influence from everyone with whom we interact. In this way, we are both leaders and followers. Our ethical responsibility is to be a good influence and not allow ourselves to be co-opted or pressured into doing or accepting what is wrong. To be trusted leaders and followers we must live by and uphold the Army Ethic. Direct leaders inspire and motivate others to embrace and live our shared identity as trusted Army professionals.

Slide 8 – Implementation and Assessment Plan

These are the major activities that will occur during each Phase of Implementation. Planning for Implementation:

LOE 1: ASA (M&RA), HQDA DCS G-1, TRADOC, USAWC (USNWC/NATO)
LOE 2: ASA (M&RA), HQDA DCS G-1, TRADOC, FORSCOM, ARNG, USAR – SME (GVV, Speed of Trust, The First Tee, ASLTE)
LOE 3: TRADOC, FORSCOM, SME (GVV)
Assessment: ASA (M&RA), DUSA (AAG/RFL Person-event Data Environment), HQDA DCS G-1 (ARI), Tufts University

Slides 9 – 17 – LOE 1, 2, 3.

Army Culture of Trust—Strategic Leaders

The Army’s strategic leaders are responsible for strengthening the Army culture of trust and the Army as an institution. Strategic leaders establish the policies, programs, and systems that shape Army culture, define recruiting, support professional organizational climates, and motivate individuals to live by and uphold our shared identity. For example: AR 600-20, AR 600-100, AR 350-1, ALDS (Leader Requirements Model), ADP/ADRP 5-0, ADP/ADRP 6-0, and ADP/ADRP 6-22. The message the Army conveys to the American people in official publications and all media should include the nature of the Army as a trusted military profession, dedicated to providing honorable service in support and defense of the Constitution. Army recruiters have direct contact with the youth of America and their families. They are uniquely positioned to represent the Army as a trusted military profession. While educational, financial, and other incentives are important attractions for many prospective Soldiers, these should be presented as supporting the opportunity to honorably serve in defense of the Nation.
Professional Organizational Climate—Organizational Leaders

_In a Professional Organizational Climate the expectation and standard is that all will live by and uphold the Army Ethic in the exercise of Mission Command._ Leaders of Army organizations are responsible for ensuring the readiness of their organizations and for accomplishing the mission in the right way. They establish and continuously strengthen the professional organizational climate that is necessary for mutual trust and cohesion. To support situational understanding, organizational leaders must have the means to assess the state of the professional climate and know how to redress conditions that fail to meet professional standards. Currently, the Army lacks effective resources to assist leaders in doing so. Therefore, the Army should research, develop, and adopt resources supporting leaders’ assessments of the professional climate within their organizations. Army organizations ensure PME/CES and organizational training are designed and implemented to prepare Army leaders for the ethical challenges of winning in a complex world. The Army Ethic and its application in decisions and actions are taught and practiced in PME/CES and organizational training. Organizational leaders provide feedback to Army schools to ensure they are graduating students who are able to contribute to the mission. As stewards of the profession we continually advance our expert knowledge and skills in landpower and certify Army professionals. Certification verifies and validates an Army professional’s character, competence, and commitment to fulfill responsibilities and successfully perform assigned duties.

Identity—Direct Leaders

Embracing our shared identity, self-development, and lifelong learning begin with individual motivation, supplemented by a concerted team effort, including coaching and counseling from superiors, peers, and subordinates. Mentorship can help focus self-development efforts to achieve professional objectives. Soldiers and Army Civilians should review and reflect on case studies where decision making properly anticipated ethical challenges and accounted for them in assessment of courses of action and examples where ethical implications were ignored. Army leaders acknowledge and accept their responsibility to develop character in themselves and others.

Assessment

Under the philosophy and doctrine of mission command, the principle of shared “situational understanding” requires continuous effort to discern the relevant past and present circumstances and their influence on all phases of the operation. With situational understanding, the leader (decision maker) can adjust mission orders and continue progress to achieve the intent (accomplish the mission). G-1 (ARI); DUSA (AAG/RFL -- Person-event Data Environment [PDE]), Tufts University.
ENCL 2. Supplementary comments and observations following the conclusion of the Army Character Development Project Team, 1st FY18 Meeting (Telecon), 11 October 2017.

1. Background: Based on notes taken by recorders in the telecon, CAPE prepared and distributed a DRAFT Memorandum for Record (MFR) and invited participants to provide edits or additional comments and reflections following the telecon. These are summarized below in topic order. The detailed notes from the meeting are also appended, without attribution, to complete the record.

2. Summary:

a. An overarching comment, provided in an email following the meeting, voiced a note of caution: "Initiatives to advance character development should not be at the cost of diminished focus on areas that will make the most impact on readiness and strong leadership."

In consideration of this concern, others observed the project Mission Analysis and both Army White Papers emphasize that character development cannot and will not be separated from leader development. Character Development is intended to enhance readiness by strengthening mutual trust and cohesive teamwork.

b. Regarding the importance of shared identity, certification, and culture, one team member expressed this concern: “If identity and culture are dictated and controlled within a tight shot-group and practiced through cohesion, conformity and loyalty, a number of unintended consequences are likely to emerge. It would discourage diverse and critical thinking. The challenges ahead of the US and its military demand divergent thinking. Since the expressed ideas demand conformity, it will discourage free-thought and candor. Too much guidance on beliefs about identity, climate, and character could drive ethical lapses underground or make them more acceptable by changing how they are rationalized. It could discourage dissenting voices that would actually be trying to seek correction of questionable behaviors. Brings to mind ‘thought police' and ‘political commissars’.”

In response, another view was offered: “A common shared identity does not mean the Army Profession will suffer from group think, conformity, lack of critical thinking, or free-thought. A common identity and ethic simply mean we share common values. It’s quite possible for people with common values to think differently about professional topics.”

Another participant wrote: “Policy on identity? So – if someone does not ‘identify’ in the prescribed manner, then what? Dangerously slippery slope. The use of ‘identity’ is ambiguous. Who’s identity and which one (Soldier, Civic, Personal). Similarly, ‘certification” of what? Character? Climate? It appears this allows the Character Development charter to expand to, and dictate, organizational climate? Isn’t that the duty of a commander? Re: assessment of the framework achieving success – what are the parameters and does it ever stop?”
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In response to these concerns, we note that failure to embrace our identity as demonstrated in decisions and actions is already prescribed in law (Title 10, Sec 3583) and policy (AR 600-100, para 1-5). Upholding the Army Ethic and enforcing law and regulations are mandatory.

c. In reference to the CG, CAC approved *The Army's Framework for Character Development* and the proposed path forward for implementation and assessment, one suggested: “Perhaps we should assess first - is there an actual requirement, a widespread issue to address? Addressing actual, identified gaps v lapses?”

In response, the complete background and history of the project is documented at [http://cape.army.mil/character-development-project/](http://cape.army.mil/character-development-project/). Records include the Mission Analysis, Literature Review, foundational White Paper, and final product. These documents address the CNA HD Gap #501028, APLDF Initiative I-14-007, and cite the authority for the project under HQDA EXORD 086-16, Human Dimension. The “assessment” that will be addressed in implementation planning relates to the success of the framework in achieving its end state.

However, one commenter noted: “As written, this MFR implies consensus and doesn’t acknowledge critical comments made by participants.” In light of this comment, we are including the recorder’s notes of the meeting (below). The intent of the base MFR is to document the content of the agenda and substantive comments that require some action or review before moving forward.

In any case, there were no dissenting comments regarding the propriety of the framework or the APLDF-directed requirement to plan for implementation and assessment (FY18 APL #2P). Other participants voiced or emailed affirmation for: the importance of identity; imbedding the framework within the Army Campaign Plan and Army Strategic Plan; ensuring that action is consistent with doctrine; and present, disparate approaches to assessment of climate are unsatisfactory. These comments are consistent with the rationale for initiatives in Annex B of *The Army Framework for Character Development* and the supporting objectives and tasks in the emerging plan (ENCL 1).

d. One person asked: “Where is ‘proponency’ covered?” In response we note that proponency is addressed within the meeting slide deck, which accompanies the MFR (ENCL 1). The need for a proponent for organizational climate is noted on Slide 13, covering Supporting Objectives 2.1; and a proponent for Army Professional Certification is noted on Slide 15, covering Supporting Objective 2.3. In the MFR, para 4.d. notes that ASA (M&RA) will be asked to charter an Army working group to propose synchronized policy guidance regarding: identity, certification, climate, and assessment.

e. In reference to the statement in the MFR, para 4.a., “*The Army’s Framework for Character Development* is the ALDS implemented in accordance with the Army Ethic,” one participant wrote: “This statement implies that the ALDS is not currently implemented
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in a way aligned to the Army Ethic. Does evidence of this exist? Is the intent to have the character framework displace the ALDS?"

In response, the description of the framework is “normative” and is not judgmental. The Army White paper “addresses what we must do to develop character as a deliberate component of leader development. It describes what is desired and intended, and it identifies initiatives (see Annex B) to achieve its vision. It is not a discussion or evaluation of the current situation, and it does not provide individuals or organizations a checklist for how to develop or assess character.”

f. Also para 4.a. of the MFR states: “The ALDS is based on Army Profession, mission command, and leadership and leader development doctrine.” This statement is included in the signed Army White Paper (see Foreword). However, one participant challenged this statement. He noted that the ALDS is based on meeting seven imperatives by achieving the ends, using the ways, and with the means; and identifies enablers “to grow Soldiers and [Army C]ivilians into competent, committed leaders of character.” However, a review of the ALDS imperatives, ways, ends, and means finds they are based on Army Profession, mission command, and leadership and leader development doctrine. (ALDS 2013, p10)

g. There was some additional email exchange regarding “professional organizational climate.” One observer noted that professional climate is not defined within Army regulation or doctrine. He suggested using command climate. In this regard, we note that several regulations and other Army publications use the word “climate” in varying ways and there is a lack of synchronization and coherence regarding what is desired within a unit or organizational climate.

Given the importance of climate in contributing to character development, the intent, expressed in The Army Framework for Character Development, is to achieve consensus understanding of what is desired in all organizational climates, how to achieve it, how to asses it, and how to remediate conditions that do not meet expectations. This includes all organizations, not just “commands.”

The Army White Paper expresses what is desired: “…organizational leaders…establish and sustain professional climates where all are inspired and expected to live by and uphold the Army Ethic in the exercise of mission command." (p.4.) The effort never stops because circumstances are always changing. Character must continuously be developed and assessed. Leader development is a lifelong responsibility.

Respondents noted that Para 4.d (3) of the MFR implies that climate is not already defined, taught, or assessed. “Before creating a ton of work, we should conduct an assessment of what’s being done. More can be done – always true, but is what is done now unsatisfactory; what is lacking (is it the education and tools or the spin that decision makers apply); what evidence is there that current practices are not satisfactory? For example, climate is already defined/addressed in AR 600-20. Further, command climate
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is currently taught in PME/CES and SCP. Are we suggesting it is not addressed or assessed “correctly” – or is the intent to modify current climate survey to address gaps?”

This issue is fully covered in the literature review. The overall finding is that there is no consensus in the Army regarding what is desired in an organizational climate, how to achieve it, how to assess climate, and how to address areas of concern. The intent of Initiative 4 and SO 2.1 is to gain consensus on what is desired (all live by and uphold the Army Ethic in the exercise of mission command), how to achieve it, how to assess climate, and how to remediate issues.

h. In Para 4.b., the MFR states: “Within the ALDS, character development integrated within all developmental activities is a continuous process, through education, training, and experience that strengthens the resolve of Trusted Army Professionals to live by and uphold the Army Ethic, to include the Army Values, as demonstrated in our decisions and actions. One person wrote: “As written, this suggests that character development is a discreet activity and not linked to a leader’s overall development as a professional.” In response, we disagree, it means the opposite.

i. One person asked: “Why italicize Trusted Army Professionals? Do we (as an Army) actually value character development over other developmental areas? Why call it out specifically?”

In response, we note that a Trusted Army Professional must consistently demonstrate character, competence, and commitment. In this project, the Army is focusing on the requirement for character development. In support of this emphasis, one respondent offered that there is a character problem in the Army. For example, see the CASAL and CASAP Reports, research, such as “Lying to Ourselves,” and the report from the Junior Leader Army Profession Forum at JBLM. He referenced news reports that bring to light misconduct at multiple levels. Additionally, the Army has a responsibility to deliberately develop character. All Army leaders must accept the responsibility to develop character within themselves and others. This is the intent for The Army Framework for Character Development.

j. One question was raised addressing certification: asking: “Can one’s identity or character be ‘certified’… that merits discussion to determine if it can and then what are the metrics used to certify – continuous or episodic?” This is an important question and supports the importance of addressing certification in planning for implementation of the framework. As defined in AR 600-100, an Army professional is a Soldier or Army Civilian who meets the Army Profession criteria in character, competence, and commitment.

Certification is verification and validation of an Army professional’s character, competence, and commitment to fulfill responsibilities and perform assigned duties with discipline and to standard. Through progressive certification, the Army strengthens trust by confirming the professional development of Soldiers and Army Civilians and the readiness of organizations. This said, there is no current consensus on the operational
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requirements to be certified in character, competence, and commitment. Accordingly, Initiative 6 (Army Framework for Character Development, Annex B) and SO 2.3 (Slide 15) address this issue.

k. Within the MFR, para 4.d.(4) addresses “full operational capability.” One person asked what this means. Specifically: “A ton of questions should be raised and answered to avoid premature approval at APLDF 18-1 (per para 5.1).”

In response, we note that the decision we are requesting at APLDF 18-1 is to proceed with implementation planning. The goal for FY 18 is to develop an approved implementation and assessment plan, leading to full implementation by FY 21.

l. In para 4.e. of the MRF, we make a point that it is important to identify the POC for each organization to represent the perspective of the Senior Responsible Officer, ensuring proper coordination and consensus as the implementation plan matures. One person asked why. The concern is “the unintended consequence of quashing diversity of thought, which could lead to perceptions of collusion instead of collaboration – especially with the comment to ‘ensure consensus’ – consensus might be a higher bar than can be achieved through this effort.”

In reply we believe that consensus, achieved through deliberation and assessment of alternatives, is consistent with the leadership philosophy of mission command, which requires mutual trust, cohesive teamwork, shared understanding of both the situation and the leader’s (commander’s) intent, disciplined initiative, assuming prudent risk, and acting on mission orders.

m. One person noted the existence of present doctrine addressing the importance of character. This observation is addressed in the literature review. However, this project intends to ensure that policy and doctrine regarding character and character development are consistent and synchronized at all levels of leadership, supporting its sequential and progressive inclusion within education, training, and operations. Another respondent wrote: “While I concur that leader development doctrine does address character, and gives a nod to the idea of developing character, I submit that like team building, the doctrine is long on theory and short on practical value – and virtually ignored in the training and education domain. If character matters (as we agree it does), its development should not be left to chance, and should be scaled to need across a career span. I also agree that many of the planned initiatives and supporting objectives actually create a persuasive, persistent, and easily integrated solution that is much like the actions a mentor undertakes with a protégé over a span of time. Effective CD is not, should not be, a separate lesson taught in every level of PME – that has been the practice with critical thinking, and we see how ineffective that approach has been. If there is anything that perhaps has not been as clearly described as it needs to be – and one of the questions asked in the comments – what is the nature of the problem that demands this level of comprehensive intervention. I think that many, not giving to thinking too deeply about some things at the expense of other, more pressing short-term issues, don't appreciate
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the need. More importantly, the Army's challenge with CD will only grow over time as the cultural values of US citizens decay further every day. Gaining consensus on how the Army should integrate efforts to strengthen character within education, training, and experience is an Army Chief of Staff priority."

3. Conclusion: These discussions are well-summarized by one SME who noted: “Nothing is going to be easy in the future as we implement CD within LD. The best I can say is, perseverance counts!”

Recorder’s Notes: Army Character Development Project Team Meeting (Telecon), 11 October 2017

- The meeting opened with a brief review of the Army Character Development Project. It’s origins are in the Army Profession Campaign, 2011; the publication of ADP 1, 2012; the Army Leader Development Strategy, 2013; publication of the Army Ethic in ADRP 1, 2015; and culminating in the Army White Paper, “The Army’s Framework for Character Development,” 2017.
- The purpose of the present meeting (telecon) is to gain situational understanding of the FY 18, APLDF I-14-007, APL #2P, to plan for implementation and assessment of the approved framework for character development. Each briefing slide was discussed in some detail, and participants were invited to engage in discussion or ask questions throughout the meeting.
- The framework for character development includes roles and responsibilities for leaders at all levels and requires an Army culture of trust, professional organizational climates, and individual commitment to embrace our shared identity as Trusted Army Professionals. Discussion on identity included a question on “identity theory” and the potential relevance of “The Power of Identity” by Manuel Castells. As with character, identity is shaped before, during, and after the Army. Identity incorporates multiple roles in life (e.g., as citizens, spouses, parents) and these must be compatible with the identity of a Soldier or Army Civilian in order to serve in the Army Profession. In addition, the Army is a diverse community (family), and this is a strength and also a motivation for embracing shared values and shared identity.
- The 3 Lines of Effort (LOE), are intended to achieve the end state and accomplish the mission by attaining the main objectives and conducting assessment. The plan envisions 4 phases of implementation. The goal in Phase I is to write, staff, and gain approval for the implementation and assessment plan at APLDF 18-4. [Discussion included the observation that the effort must be cognizant of ongoing efforts that will support implementation of the framework (e.g., USAWC action to prepare strategic leaders, the update of relevant TRADOC publications addressing training and education and faculty development, and the recent publication of ADP 3-0 and subordinate documents)]. All concurred.
• Regarding the importance of organizational climate, there was considerable discussion about what is intended in an organizational climate and how to assess the state of an organization’s climate. This discussion included present methods (e.g., Defense Equal Opportunity Climate Survey [DEOCS], Ethical Climate Assessment Survey [ECAS]). Others noted the importance of focus groups, interviews, and site visits by external teams. Partnering with other services to learn their best practices is encouraged (e.g., USMC). ARI is currently funding a study of unit climate focused on “respect, dignity, and inclusion.” This observation reinforces the importance of understanding what is desired within organizational climate. There may be no “one size fits all” solution. Leaders may need a variety of resources to help establish, assess, and adjust the climate within their organizations.

• In the discussions, some cited ongoing efforts to contribute to character development. For example, one Center of Excellence is working with Drill Sergeants to strengthen ethical reasoning skills in decision making, identity, and moral considerations in leadership. Efforts to assist with self-awareness include use of a personality inventory and measures of emotional and social competence. As a measure of effectiveness, Soldier attrition decreased from 12% to 5% after Drill Sergeants completed the training.

• Discussion included the importance of tying all work to policy and doctrine. Others noted ensuring relevancy within overarching efforts (e.g., Army Campaign Plan, Army Strategic Plan, and the Human Capital Annex, etc.).