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USAREC and USAAC asked us to redefine “Soldier Quality” in a quantifiable manner. In order to do so, we employed Value-Focused Thinking as the methodology for consultation with the Army concerning the performance attributes desired in Soldiers. The resulting WholeSoldier model is useful for both mentoring of Soldiers and informing strategic personnel decisions. WholeSoldier Performance is now being implemented for mentoring in one Army division and in a basic training unit; the data generated will inform a variety of recruiting decisions.
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**Approach**

**Longitudinal Study**
- High Cost
- Long Duration
- Collect massive amounts of data on what we think might solve the problem, and see if something useful is revealed over time.
- “We’ll see in the end.”

**Value-Focused Study**
- Low Cost
- Short Duration
- First determine “what we want.”
- Collect focused data and make inferences on the larger population.
- “Begin with the end in mind.” - Stephen Covey

“Many hiring decisions start off on the wrong foot because the company hasn’t clarified exactly what it wants in the new hire.”


“The perfection of means and confusion of ends seems to characterize our age.” - Einstein

Both are needed, but value-focused studies or “what we want” should inspire longitudinal studies.
WholeSoldier Performance Model

**Purpose:**
- Selfless Service
- Sacrifice
- Commitment
- Loyalty
- Duty

**Motivation:**
- Will to Win
- Endurance
- Resilience
- Stick-to-it-iveness
- Heart / Drive
- Determination
- Determination
- Work Ethic

**Character:**
- Honor
- Integrity
- Justice
- Candor
- Personal Courage

**Conduct:**
- Maturity
- Discipline
- Bearing
- Coolness

**Interaction:**
- Respect
- Empathy
- Compassion
- Humor

**Knowledge:**
- Job Tasks/Skills
- Education
- Trainability
- Learning

**Judgment:**
- Common Sense
- Logical Decisions
- Understanding
- Anticipation
- Insight/Filtering
- Adaptive/Flexible

**Application:**
- Planning
- Communicating
- Executing

**Medical Health:**
- Illness Resistance
- Nutrition
- Body Composition

**Athletic Skills:**
- Coordination
- Agility
- Balance
- Power
- Speed
- Accuracy
- Flexibility
- Reaction Time

**General Fitness:**
- Cardio Endurance
- Cardio Strength
- Muscular Endurance
- Muscular Strength

**Cognitive Domain:**

**Moral Domain:**

**Physical Domain:**

**Self-Esteem:**
- Confidence
- Self-Worth
- Self-Efficacy

TEACHING FUTURE ARMY LEADERS TO SOLVE COMPLEX PROBLEMS
WholeSoldier Model in Action

TEACHING FUTURE ARMY LEADERS TO SOLVE COMPLEX PROBLEMS
“WholeSoldier” Sample Performance Report
Infantryman #24

Moral Performance = 44/59 = 5.22/7
• Character- Totally trustworthy, and always sticks up for what is right.
• Purpose- Displays commitment and self-sacrifice to the team 95% of the time.
• Motivation- Soldier puts forth max effort and only rarely gives less than his all.
• Interaction – Shows respect and is compassionate, but sometimes is awkward in interpersonal interactions.
• Self-Esteem- Doesn’t display confidence or view himself as a valuable member of the team.
• Conduct – Soldier displays maturity and discipline by completing tasks without supervision, but sometimes loses his cool when under stress.

Cognitive Performance = 15/25 = 4.20/7
• Knowledge- Soldier demonstrates total knowledge of MOS tasks and studies to learn next level up.
• Judgment- Makes logical decisions, but has problems filtering irrelevant information.
• Application- Sometimes unable to plan effectively to implement decisions.

Physical Performance = 12/16 = 5.25/7
• Fitness- Scored 263 last APFT.
• Athleticism- Displays better than average coordination, agility in combat-focused tasks.
• Health- Maintains body better than average.

“We can better mentor...”
“WholeSoldier” Performance = 71/100 = 4.97/7
WholeSoldier Performance Study

**Primary Recommendation:** The Army should *routinely* assess “WholeSoldier” Performance along a *continuum* across the *entire force*. Using “WholeSoldier” Performance as an *endstate metric* opens the door to many *strategic possibilities* that will inform decisions relating to Soldiers.

---

**Bottom Up Evaluation**

**Top Down Elicitation**

*Pairwise comparison for order*¹

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Asset</th>
<th>Asset A</th>
<th>Asset B</th>
<th>Asset C</th>
<th>Asset D</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asset A</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asset B</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asset C</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asset D</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Bonus assignment for value*

---

¹. www.thesecurityminute.com
## WholeSoldier

### Sample Population Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4 Infantry Platoons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Method:

1. Assess sub-domain performance (1-7).
2. Evaluate performance holistically (1-100).
3. Use correlation analysis to infer weights.

### Finding / Insight:

a. WholeSoldier “tells the story” of individual areas of relative strength and weakness and allows us to “see” the entire population.

### Conclusion:

a. We can provide many levels of distinction on WholeSoldier Performance.

b. WholeSoldier Performance assessment is useful feedback to subordinates for use as a developmental counseling tool.

c. WholeSoldier Performance is a good “endstate metric” and will provide information for sound decision-making in many areas.

---

**THE FOLLOWING INSIGHTS ARE ONLY POSSIBLE BECAUSE WE HAVE CLEARLY DEFINED OUR DESIRED ENDSTATE!**
Given “WholeSoldier” Performance implementation, we can better:

**Recruit**: Develop holistic model of “WholeRecruit” Potential **longitudinally** and:

- **Quantify risks/opportunities** involved in adjusting enlistment policies/standards.
- “**Screen in**” during times of recruiting difficulty and “**screen out**” in times of recruiting richness.
- **Offer individual incentives** for various MOS based on WholeRecruit Potential, desires of the candidate, and needs of the Army.
- Continually **consider various “entry metrics”** for updates to the WholeRecruit model.
- **Adjust target market** and allocate assets based on both quantity and quality.
- **Adjust marketing message** to target “who we want.”
- **Issue recruiting missions** to reflect a distinct quantity vs. quality balance.

**Expected Soldier Performance Given Varying Recruit Potential**

- **= High Performance based on Potential**
- **= Expected Performance**
- **= Low Performance based on Potential**

**NOTE**: Only for discussion of possibilities; not intended as a conclusive result for use in current decisions.
Given “WholeSoldier” Performance implementation, we can better:

**Develop and Counsel Soldiers:**

Provide Strategic Situational Awareness:

- Policy Decision

- Business Model

= Measured Effect

Situational Awareness
Soldier Potential to Performance Model

Client: Accessions Command

Reverse Engineering Soldier Performance

**Purpose**
Develop an application to predict the future performance of a recruit based upon attributes we can observe about that recruit upon their indication of interest in service.

**Objectives**
- Identify pre-existing attributes that indicate the potential for a high performing Soldier
- Develop predictive models that leverage the known attributes of a recruit to predict performance in an operational unit
- Improved ability to screen soldiers who are unlikely to perform well in units

**Technical Approach**
- Identify Data Shortfalls: Officer Candidate vs. Enlisted Soldier
- Surveys for Additional Data Collection
- WholeSoldier Performance Assessment
- Data Mining (Regression, Neural Networks, LDA, SVM etc.) to link Performance to Potential

**Deliverables**
- QRR Presentation on Methodology (JAN 09)
- OSUT Success Prediction Model (MAR ‘10)
- In-Unit Success P2P Model (JUL ‘10)
- Final Briefing (JUL’10)
- Technical report (AUG 1’0)
WholeSoldier Performance Assessment

**Poor Performance**
“Screen Out”

- Character < 1.5
  - 5.46
  - 28.68
- Physical Fitness < 4.5
  - 36.98
  - 67.33

**Excellence**
“Screen In”

- Character < 4.5
- Conduct < 4.5
- Capability < 5.5
- Motivation < 4.5
- Medical Fitness < 4.0
- Thought < 5.5
- Purpose < 5.5

**Acceptable**

- Conduct > 4.5
- Medical Fitness < 4.0
- 49.37
- 81.77
- 71.52
- 79
- 97.02

TEACHING FUTURE ARMY LEADERS TO SOLVE COMPLEX PROBLEMS
Excellence

Accuracy = 45%
Precision = 100%

Poor Performance

Accuracy = 36%
Precision = 100%
## Soldier Record Development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictors</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Accessions Database</strong></td>
<td><strong>Unit Record</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- ASVAB/AFQT</td>
<td><strong>Positive</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- HS Diploma</td>
<td>- SOM / SOQ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Medical Waiver</td>
<td>- Promotion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Moral Waiver</td>
<td>- APFT/Rifle Qual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Age</td>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Demographics</td>
<td>- UCMJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Family</td>
<td>- Chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Family History</td>
<td>- Conduct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TAPAS Score</strong></td>
<td><strong>Positive</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- “Can Do”</td>
<td>- Character</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- “Will Do”</td>
<td>- Motivation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Soldier Survey</strong></td>
<td>- Thought</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Athletics</td>
<td>- Purpose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Leadership</td>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Extracurricular</td>
<td>- Character</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Scouting</td>
<td>- Conduct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Work History</td>
<td>- Thought</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Family History</td>
<td>- Purpose</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**WholeSoldier Evaluation**

- Positive
- Negative

**Teaching Future Army Leaders to Solve Complex Problems**
The Research Question

- What attributes are statistically linked to poor performance?
  - Failure to complete OSUT
  - WholeSoldier Performance Assessment Model (Character and Conduct)
  - Unit Recommendation of Removal (WholeSoldier Counseling)
  - APFT/Marksmanship Failure
  - Article 15/UCMJ Action in Unit

- What attributes are statistically linked to excellence?
  - Special Recognition in OSUT
  - Special Recognition in Unit (Soldier Boards, Promotion etc.)
  - APFT/Marksmanship Excellence
  - WholeSoldier Performance Assessment Model (Character, Motivation, Thought, Purpose)
Hypothetical WholeSoldier Application

- The outcome of this analysis is a series of profiles.
- Because of measurement error (accuracy/precision) on the response variables, it is not possible to calculate the probability of poor performance for a given profile.
- It is possible to calculate a lower bound of that probability using the presumption of competence.
- We can use that lower bound as a profile risk score.

**Profile X**
- Data Set of 1000
- 95 observations
- 45 “Poor Performers”

\[
\text{Lower Bound of } P(\text{Poor} | X) = 47\%
\]

**Profile Y**
- Data Set of 1000
- 150 observations
- 20 “Poor Performers”

\[
\text{Lower Bound of } P(\text{Poor} | Y) = 13\%
\]
Hypothetical WholeSoldier Application

- The outcome of this analysis is a series of profiles.
- Because of measurement error (accuracy/precision) on the response variables, it is not possible to calculate the probability of poor performance for a given profile.
- It is possible to calculate a lower bound of that probability using the presumption of competence.
- We can use that lower bound as a profile risk score.

Profile X:
- Data Set of 1000
- 95 observations
- 45 WholeSoldier Failures

Lower Bound of P(Poor | X) = 47%

Profile Y:
- Data Set of 1000
- 150 observations
- 20 WholeSoldier Failures

Lower Bound of P(Poor | Y) = 13%

The hard part is identifying statistically significant profiles
Hypothetical WholeSoldier Application

- The outcome of this analysis is a series of profiles.
- Because of measurement error (accuracy/precision) on the response variables, it is not possible to calculate the probability of poor performance for a given profile.
- It is possible to calculate a lower bound of that probability using the presumption of competence.
- We can use that lower bound as a profile risk score.

**Profile X**
- Data Set of 1000
- 95 observations
- 45 WholeSoldier Failures

\[
\text{Lower Bound of } P(\text{Poor} | X) = 47\%
\]

**Profile Y**
- Data Set of 1000
- 150 observations
- 20 WholeSoldier Failures

\[
\text{Lower Bound of } P(\text{Poor} | Y) = 13\%
\]
Questions/Discussion

1. WholeSoldier Performance Study (MAJ Dees)
   Problem: The Army needs a holistic model of Soldier performance in the moral, cognitive, and physical domains.

2. WholeOfficer Performance Study (Cadets)
   Problem: The Army needs a system to accurately assess the performance of officers in a holistic manner that provides significant distinction.

3. WholeCadet Performance Study (Cadets)
   Problem: USMA needs a system to accurately assess the performance of cadets in a holistic manner that provides significant distinction.

4. WholeRecruit Potential to Performance Study (MAJ Huddleston)
   Problem: The Army needs a holistic model of recruit potential to predict WholeSoldier Performance. The Army can establish automated data-basing of WholeSoldier Performance data that facilitates longitudinal modeling of WholeRecruit Potential to provide strategic situational awareness and leading indicators.
Quality Cadet: Problem Definition and Idea Generation

By:
CDT Bunz
CDT Morrison
CDT Park
CDT Shields
The Problem
Admissions
Current System
Breakdown of Current Cadet Assessment
Current Evaluation System
Issues
Assessment Tool
Solution Implementation
• Problem
  – Currently the United States Military Academy assesses cadets based on Academic, Military, and Physical performance. However, the measures used to evaluate cadets and the weights assigned to each subcategory of the three pillars may not accurately reflect the qualities that West Point should be concerned with when focused on molding future Army Officers.

• Assumption
  – Cadet Leader Development System (CLDS) document represents what we want with regards to cadet assessment.
  – We will assess cadets in line with CLDS
The United States Military Academy stands to produce commissioned leaders of character, ones that produce on and off the battlefield. Thus, West Point strives to achieve a standard out of each cadet in certain areas that are believed to correlate well to the Army. Cadets are ranked based on these criteria, leading to a Cadet Performance Score at the end of their time here at West Point. This ranking determines what branch of the Army and what unit the cadet will serve in, based on merit-based selections.

The Academy needs a system to accurately assess the performance of cadets in a holistic manner that provides sufficient distinction. The system should reflect what we want and provide insight into the true quality of a cadet.
Current Assessment Continued:

\[ CPS = 0.4z + 0.2 \]

\[ z = \frac{CPS^*}{\sigma_{CPS_{class}}} \]

\[ CPS^* = 0.55APS^* + 0.30MPS^* + 0.15PPS^* \]

Diagram:

- APS^*
  - APSC
    - \[ APSC - APSC_{classmean} \] / \( \sigma_{APSC} \)
- MPS^*
  - MPSC
    - \[ MPSC - MPSC_{classmean} \] / \( \sigma_{MPSC} \)
- PPS^*
  - PPSC
    - \[ PPSC - PPSC_{classmean} \] / \( \sigma_{PPSC} \)
Continued: CLDS

Subjectively Assessed: not included in formal assessment of cadets.
• Tools used to “subjectively assess” the military domain:
  – Periodic Development Reviews (PDR)
  – Paper Counseling
  – Cadet Observation Reports (COR)
• Are these tools effective?
  – NO!
    • PDRs, counseling, and CORs are rarely referenced when grading an individual on military performance

• Does 360 degree assessment exist?
  – Not explicitly!
  – The Rater, Intermediate Rater, and TAC control 100% of the individuals grade
    • What about the subordinates, peers, and other influencers external to the CoC?
• MAJ Mayo: Representative of the Brigade Tactical Department
  – When grading cadets militarily, “we need to take a 360 degree approach.”

• COL Sweeny: Member of the CLDS committee and coauthor of Leadership Lessons from West Point.
  – He feels that a 360 degree assessment is a necessity for Cadet Development.
• MAJ Geraci: Representative of Behavioral Studies and Leadership
  – “The perfect officer is someone who can think, feel, sense, and be intuitive.”
  – “Maybe the best way to measure these are in the military domain.”

• MAJ Scioletti: Representative of Math Department
  – “[West Point] needs to get away from subjective military grading”
Our Goal

Quantitatively Assessed

Subjectively Assessed

Implied Assessment: not included in formal assessment of cadets

360° ASSESSMENT

Competence

- Intellectual
- Military

Character

- Social
- Moral/Ethical
- Human Spirit
Our Model

• Assessment Tool
  – Category headings of
    • Individual Character and Competence
      – 9 questions for Character and 9 questions for Competence
        » Rated on a 0-4 scale by Superiors, Subordinates, and Peers
          » 4: Above Center of Mass Upper Half
          » 3: Above Center of Mass Lower Half
          » 2: Center of Mass
          » 1: Below Center of Mass
          » 0: Below Center of Mass Do Not Retain
  – The model will sum the scores and generate a total.
  – The total will correspond with an assigned letter grade.
**Example of Assessment Form**

### INDIVIDUAL CHARACTER

1. **Moral Courage**: Strength to seek to discover the truth and decide what is right. Ability to make the right decision based on values and principles despite consequences.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Character</th>
<th>Competence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Moral Courage</td>
<td>Motivation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courage</td>
<td>Professionalism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance under stress</td>
<td>Presence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humility</td>
<td>Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiative</td>
<td>Knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairness</td>
<td>Creativity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resilience</td>
<td>Leader (Rater)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selflessness</td>
<td>Follower (Rater)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compassion</td>
<td>Team Player (Rater)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Does not exhibit moral/ethical behavior on a daily basis. Fails to possess personal integrity in his or her decisions.</th>
<th>Makes sound decisions with minor lapses in judgement. Displays a desire for continual improvement.</th>
<th>Demonstrates excellent decision making based on principles of doing what is right. Respected as the highest moral example for others.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. **Courage**: Personal acceptance of accountability and responsibility. Strength to overcome difficulties or fears.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Character</th>
<th>Competence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Creativity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Leader (Rater)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Follower (Rater)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Team Player (Rater)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Organization</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Fails to put forth an effort to accomplish the mission. Tends to show coward-like behavior.</th>
<th>Possesses the ability to put fear aside to accomplish the mission; however, has not yet internalized this mentality. Shows signs of hesitation but is eager to improve.</th>
<th>Strives to accomplish the mission and overcome any obstacles that pose potential problems without hesitation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Attributes derived from a combination of input from Cadets, Officers, Nate Self, the Commandant, and our Capstone Team.*
Implementation Experiment

- Test on First Class Cadets in 3rd Regiment
- Email assessment to designated raters
- Compare results with Cadets’ current Military Grades
- Interview TAC Officer for thoughts and feedback.
Questions
Quality Cadet: Problem Definition and Idea Generation

By:
CDT Bunz
CDT Morrison
CDT Park
CDT Shields
Agenda

• The Problem
• Admissions
• Current System
• Breakdown of Current Cadet Assessment
• Current Evaluation System
• Issues
• Assessment Tool
• Solution Implementation
Define the Problem

• Problem
  – Currently the United States Military Academy assesses cadets based on Academic, Military, and Physical performance. However, the measures used to evaluate cadets and the weights assigned to each subcategory of the three pillars may not accurately reflect the qualities that West Point should be concerned with when focused on molding future Army Officers.

• Assumption
  – Cadet Leader Development System (CLDS) document represents what we want with regards to cadet assessment.
  – We will assess cadets in line with CLDS
The United States Military Academy stands to produce commissioned leaders of character, ones that produce on and off the battlefield. Thus, West Point strives to achieve a standard out of each cadet in certain areas that are believed to correlate well to the Army. Cadets are ranked based on these criteria, leading to a Cadet Performance Score at the end of their time here at West Point. This ranking determines what branch of the Army and what unit the cadet will serve in, based on merit-based selections.

The Academy needs a system to accurately assess the performance of cadets in a holistic manner that provides sufficient distinction. The system should reflect what we want and provide insight into the true quality of a cadet.
Current Cadet Assessment

PLEBE YEAR
- Math/Science
  - MA001/104 (6.5)
  - C071/102 (6.5)
  - IT105 (3.0)
- EngEng/CS
  - EN101/102 (6.0)
  - PL101 (3.0)
  - HH101/103 (6.0)
- Major
  - F102 (3.0)
- ABET MAJOR
  - LA201/204 (7.0)
  - LA301/302 (7.0)
  - EVO205 (3.0)
  - PY201 (3.0)
  - electives (2.0)

YUK YEAR
- Engineering (ABET as well)
  - PL300 (3.0)
  - ABET (3.0)
  - LA201/204 (7.0)
  - LA301/302 (7.0)
  - 102/107 (3.0)
- electives (3.0)

COW YEAR
- Engineering (ABET as well)
  - 210 (3.0)
  - ABET (3.0)
  - LA201/204 (7.0)
  - LA301/302 (7.0)
  - 102/107 (3.0)
- electives (3.0)

Firstie YEAR
- Engineering (ABET as well)
  - 310/117 (7.0)
  - ABET (3.0)
  - LA201/204 (7.0)
  - LA301/302 (7.0)
  - 102/107 (3.0)
- electives (3.0)

CPS
- Math/Science
  - MA001/104 (6.5)
  - C071/102 (6.5)
  - IT105 (3.0)
- EngEng/CS
  - EN101/102 (6.0)
  - PL101 (3.0)
  - HH101/103 (6.0)
- Major
  - F102 (3.0)
- ABET MAJOR
  - LA201/204 (7.0)
  - LA301/302 (7.0)
  - EVO205 (3.0)
  - PY201 (3.0)
  - electives (2.0)

Summer (7.5%)
- Fitness Testing (4.5%)
- Core Sports (5%)
- Courwork (7.5%)

AY (13.0%)
- Core Sports (7.5%)
- Company Ath. (7.5%)
- Courwork (7.5%)

MB (6.0%)
- Core Sports (7.5%)
- Company Ath. (7.5%)
- Courwork (7.5%)

Percentage:
- Plebe: 13%
- Yuk: 15%
- Cow: 15%
- Firstie: 12%
- Summer: 21.23%
- AY: 25.61%
- MB: 11.25%
- Total: 30.13%
- Fitness Testing: 4.56%
- Core Sports: 3.88%
- Courwork: 2.56%
Current Assessment Continued:

\[ CPS = 0.4z + 0.2 \]

\[ z = \frac{CPS^*}{\sigma_{CPS_{\text{class}}}^*} \]

\[ CPS^* = 0.55APS^* + 0.30MPS^* + 0.15PPS^* \]
Continued: CLDS

Quantitatively Assessed:

- Competence
  - Intellectual
  - Physical
  - Military

Subjectively Assessed:

- Character
  - Social
  - Moral/Ethical
  - Human Spirit

Implied Assessment: not included in formal assessment of cadets
• Tools used to “subjectively assess” the military domain:
  – Periodic Development Reviews (PDR)
  – Paper Counseling
  – Cadet Observation Reports (COR)
ISSUES

- Are these tools effective?
  - NO!
    - PDRs, counseling, and CORs are rarely referenced when grading an individual on military performance

- Does 360 degree assessment exist?
  - Not explicitly!
    - The Rater, Intermediate Rater, and TAC control 100% of the individuals grade
      - What about the subordinates, peers, and other influencers external to the CoC?
• MAJ Mayo: Representative of the Brigade Tactical Department
  – When grading cadets *militarily*, “we need to take a 360 degree approach.”

• COL Sweeny: Member of the CLDS committee and coauthor of *Leadership Lessons from West Point*.
  – He feels that a 360 degree assessment is a necessity for Cadet Development.
• MAJ Geraci: Representative of Behavioral Studies and Leadership
  – “The perfect officer is someone who can think, feel, sense, and be intuitive.”
  – “Maybe the best way to measure these are in the military domain.”

• MAJ Scioletti: Representative of Math Department
  – “[West Point] needs to get away from subjective military grading”
Our Goal

Quantitatively Assessed

Subjectively Assessed

Implied Assessment: not included in formal assessment of cadets

360° ASSESSMENT

- Intellectual
- Military
- Competence
- Character
- Social
- Moral/Ethical
- Human Spirit
Our Model

• Assessment Tool
  – Category headings of
    • Individual Character and Competence
      – 9 questions for Character and 9 questions for Competence
        » Rated on a 0-4 scale by Superiors, Subordinates, and Peers
          » 4: Above Center of Mass Upper Half
          » 3: Above Center of Mass Lower Half
          » 2: Center of Mass
          » 1: Below Center of Mass
          » 0: Below Center of Mass Do Not Retain
  – The model will sum the scores and generate a total.
  – The total will correspond with an assigned letter grade.
**Example of Assessment Form**

### INDIVIDUAL CHARACTER

**1. Moral Courage:** Strength to seek to discover the truth and decide what is right. Ability to make the right decision based on values and principles despite consequences.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Does not exhibit moral/ethical behavior on a daily basis. Fails to possess personal integrity in his or her decisions.</th>
<th>Makes sound decisions with minor lapses in judgement. Displays a desire for continual improvement.</th>
<th>Demonstrates excellent decision making based on principles of doing what is right. Respected as the highest moral example for others.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>◯ N/A</td>
<td>◯</td>
<td>◯</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**2. Courage:** Personal acceptance of accountability and responsibility. Strength to overcome difficulties or fears.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fails to put forth an effort to accomplish the mission. Tends to show coward-like behavior.</th>
<th>Possesses the ability to put fear aside to accomplish the mission; however, has not yet internalized this mentality. Shows signs of hesitation but is eager to improve.</th>
<th>Strives to accomplish the mission and overcome any obstacles that pose potential problems without hesitation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>◯ N/A</td>
<td>◯</td>
<td>◯</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Attributes derived from a combination of input from Cadets, Officers, Nate Self, the Commandant, and our Capstone Team.

**Character:**
- Moral Courage
- Courage
- Performance under stress
- Humility
- Initiative
- Fairness
- Resilience
- Selflessness
- Compassion

**Competence:**
- Motivation
- Professionalism
- Presence
- Communication
- Knowledge
- Creativity
- Leader (Rater)
- Follower (Rater)
- Team Player (Rater)
- Control
- Organization
Implementation Experiment

- Test on First Class Cadets in 3rd Regiment
- Email assessment to designated raters
- Compare results with Cadets’ current Military Grades
- Interview TAC Officer for thoughts and feedback.
Questions