We want leaders that are tough, resilient, that can think, and out-fight and out-smart the enemy. We want them to be adaptive and agile and flexible. And, we want them not only competent, but we want leaders of character.”

General Mark A. Milley, Chief of Staff of the Army
Remarks to the National Guard Association of the United States
(NGAUS, 11 Sep 2015)
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Discussion

• Army leaders commanding and directing Army schools connect the curriculum design and development (training developers) to the curriculum implementation (instructors). Should they be specifically developed through education, training, and experience to fulfill this critical responsibility? Why or why not?

• Should “character development” be an intended outcome in PME? Why or why not? If so, should the content of the program of instruction include experiential, activity-based learning to teach creative and critical thinking with integrated ethical reasoning. Should “character development” be an intended outcome in PME? Why or why not?

• Do you believe that curriculum developers and instructors must be taught why and how to simultaneously develop character, competence, and commitment in education and training? Why or why not? Can they learn this skill on their own?

• How can Instructors best provide for simultaneous development in character, competence, and commitment? What do they need to know and do to achieve this intent?

• Does it make sense to teach instructors why and how to integrate ethical reasoning within critical thinking? Can instructors teach learners (why and how) to make decisions and take actions consistent with the moral principles of the Army Ethic?
Character Development

The continuous process - within the institutional, operational, and self-development domains - 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.
Intrinsically, character is “one’s true nature, including identity, sense of purpose, values, virtues, morals and conscience.”

Operationally, doctrine defines character as “Dedication and adherence to the Army Ethic, including Army Values, as consistently and faithfully demonstrated in decisions and actions.”

The Army Profession certifies the character, competence, and commitment of Soldiers and Army Civilians. (ADRP 1)

Character is central to developing mutual trust and cohesive teams within Mission Command (ADRP 6-0), which in turn strengthens resilience and personal readiness while contributing to unit readiness. Character Development is a unifying theme within The Army Human Dimension Concept, the Talent Management Concept of Operations for Force 2025 and Beyond, is an essential requirement for Leader Development (ALDS, ADRP 6-22), and integral to the Army meeting Army Warfighting Challenges 4, 8, 9, 10 and 19.

PROBLEM
The Army Profession lacks a concept for Character Development of Soldiers and Army Civilians

CNA GAP #501028
FY16 ALDP
Priority List 3P

SOLUTION
Under authority of HQDA EXORD 086-16 HUMAN DIMENSION, the Character Development Project Team articulates, gains approval for, and publishes the Army Concept for Character Development – applicable within the process of leader and professional development – NLT June 2017, in order to strengthen shared identity and inform the development and certification of trusted Army professionals through education, training, and experience.

OUTCOME
Publish a concept for developing, assessing, and certifying the character of Army professionals within the existing Leader and Professional Development process of education, training, and experience

An ethical culture and organizational climate are prerequisites for character development to occur and for right conduct to flourish.

Character must be developed within the context of Leader Development.
Army Leader Development Strategy
In Accordance With
The Army Ethic

Organizational Leader Responsibilities

Organizational Climate
- Education
- Training
- Experience
- Certification
- Readiness
- Mission

Army Organizations

Trusted Army Professional
- Character
- Competence
- Commitment

Strategic Leader Responsibilities

Army as an Institution

Culture
- Recruiting
- Policies-Regulations
- Concepts-Doctrine
- Programs-Systems
- Force Structure
- Infrastructure
- Budget

Direct Leader - Follower Responsibilities

Individual

Identity
- Duty
- Self-Development
- Lifelong Learning
- Coach-Counsel-Mentor
- Ready & Resilient
- Soldier for Life

Organizational Leader Responsibilities

*The Army’s Framework for Character Development is the ALDS, implemented in accordance with the Army Ethic and synchronized at all levels of leadership: direct, organizational, and strategic.
Mission Command & Leader Development depend on the **Character, Competence, Commitment** of Army Professionals in the performance of **Duty** and all aspects of life

Trust: Essential for Readiness

- **Dedication to the Army Ethic**: Demonstrated in Decisions & Actions
- **Performance of Duty**: with Discipline & to Standard
- **Honorable Service & Mission Accomplishment**: Despite Adversity, Obstacles, & Challenges

Trust: Essential for Readiness

Training, Education, Experience

Living and Upholding the Army Ethic

Living and Upholding the Army Ethic

Commitment

Character

Competence
Intent
Why

- Army Culture of Trust
- Ethical Command Climate
- Trusted Army Professionals

Inputs
What
(Means)

- Policies, Regulations, Doctrine, Procedures
- Army Leader Development Strategy
- Human Dimension Strategy
- Instructor Certification

Process
How
(Ways)

- Army Schools
- Combat Training Centers
- Joint Readiness Exercises
- Commanders/Directors
- Assessment

Outcomes
(Ends)

- Mission Command (e,e,e)
- Duty (c,c,c)
- Transformational Leadership (c,c,m)
- Reduce SHARP/Suicide/Misconduct/Unethical Practices/Toxic leadership

Vision

- Mutual Trust & Cohesive Teamwork
- Personal & Unit Mission Readiness
- Ethical Application of Landpower
- Trust with the American people

Army Leader Development Strategy + The Army Ethic

e, e, e => ethical, effective, efficient
c, c, c, => character, competence, commitment
c, c, m => coaching, counseling, mentoring
Development of Trusted Army Professionals

Knowledge & Understanding

Adherence & Discipline

Confidence & Belief

Leadership & Wisdom

Instruction Study Reflection

Practice / Practicum & Coaching Counseling

Assessment

Experience

Knowledge

Adherence

Confidence

Leadership

Understanding

&

&

&

&

&

&

&

Discipline

Belief

Wisdom

Practice / Practicum

Coaching Counseling

Assessment

Experience

Instruction Study Reflection
Empirical Army Learning Model

Teamwork: Instructors & Learners => Mutual Trust and Cohesion in the learning process.
Performance: Practice <-> Coaching & Counseling -> C, C, C
Evaluation: Instructors Verify/Validate Performance to Standards.
Progress or Remediation: Advancement Depends on Demonstrated C, C, C

Instruction, Study, Reflection

Coaching, Counseling, Mentoring

Practice

Evaluation: Standards Met?

Progress

Remediation
**Mutual Trust & Cohesive Teamwork** => (Army Ethic): Moral Principles – *Always* Important

**Commander’s Intent** (develop the Vision): Goal or Desired State (outcome)

**Shared Situational Understanding**: Seek to Discover Truth*

**Mission Orders**: Intent – Situation = Mission (problem)
- Identify Courses of Action (creative thinking)
- Reject if action would violate any moral principle (moral-ethical reasoning)

**Prudent Risk** = Analysis (critical thinking) (compare COAs)
- Select the best “right”** COA (ethical, effective, efficient)
- Assign Responsibility, Delegate Authority, Allocate Resources, Coordinate, Rehearse

**Disciplined Initiative** = Implement: Lead and Manage (ethically, effectively, efficiently)
- Assess: Monitor, Measure, Evaluate
- Adjust: Re-enter Decision Process
1. **How big (complex/significant) is this decision?**
   Can I break this decision into smaller decisions? If so, are they dependent, sequential, concurrent? A common fallacy is that everything is “all-in.” Often, there’s the potential to break an issue into components. Then, you can see incremental effects, before taking next steps.

2. **How irrevocable is this decision?**
   Sometimes, there is turning back from a decision. Once you launch the “Normandy Invasion” or release a “fire and forget” missile you can’t change your mind. Ask, is there a “point of no return”? Even irreversible decisions may be amenable to “course corrections” based on assessment as the plan is implemented.

3. **What is the cost of being wrong? And what’s the value of being right?**
   Assess the risks. What are the expected benefits and the anticipated costs? What is the worst that can happen? What is the best outcome?

4. **How long do you have to make the decision? What time is available?**
   One common mistake is an artificial deadline. You may want to delay to allow additional information to influence the decision. What are the benefits and costs of waiting?

5. **What are my personal biases that might be affecting this decision?**
   Consult people with other backgrounds and viewpoints. Talk to SMEs.

– **Paul Petrone**
Final thoughts?