Technical Report 560

12

DEVELOPMENT OF THE PRECOMMISSIONING LEADERSHIP ASSESSMENT PROGRAM

AD A130927

Robert W. Rogers, Leonard W. Lilley, Richard S. Wellins
Development Dimensions International

M. A. Fischl and William P. Burke
Army Research Institute

LEADERSHIP AND MANAGEMENT TECHNICAL AREA

DTIC FILE COPY

DTIC
ELECTE
AUG 2 1983
S D
D

U. S. Army
Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences

February 1982

Approved for public release; distribution unlimited.

83 08 01 041

U. S. ARMY RESEARCH INSTITUTE
FOR THE BEHAVIORAL AND SOCIAL SCIENCES

A Field Operating Agency under the Jurisdiction of the

Deputy Chief of Staff for Personnel

EDGAR M. JOHNSON
Technical Director

L. NEALE COSBY
Colonel, IN
Commander

Research accomplished under contract
for the Department of the Army

Development Dimensions International

NOTICES

DISTRIBUTION: Primary distribution of this report has been made by ARI. Please address correspondence concerning distribution of reports to: U.S. Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences, ATTN: PERI-TST, 5001 Eisenhower Avenue, Alexandria, Virginia 22333.

FINAL DISPOSITION: This report may be destroyed when it is no longer needed. Please do not return it to the U.S. Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences.

NOTE: The findings in this report are not to be construed as an official Department of the Army position, unless so designated by other authorized documents.

UNCLASSIFIED

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE (When Data Entered)

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE		READ INSTRUCTIONS BEFORE COMPLETING FORM
1. REPORT NUMBER Technical Report 560	2. GOVT ACCESSION NO. AD-A130 927	3. RECIPIENT'S CATALOG NUMBER
4. TITLE (and Subtitle) Development of The Precommissioning Leadership Assessment Program		5. TYPE OF REPORT & PERIOD COVERED --
		6. PERFORMING ORG. REPORT NUMBER --
7. AUTHOR(s) Robert W. Rogers, Leonard W. Lilley, Richard S. Wellins, M. A. Fischl, William P. Burke		8. CONTRACT OR GRANT NUMBER(s) MDA 903-79-C-0519
9. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME AND ADDRESS Development Dimensions International Suite 615-N, 4550 Montgomery Avenue Bethesda, MD 20814		10. PROGRAM ELEMENT, PROJECT, TASK AREA & WORK UNIT NUMBERS 2Q263731A792
11. CONTROLLING OFFICE NAME AND ADDRESS US Army Research Institute for the Behavioral & Social Sciences, 5001 Eisenhower Avenue, Alexandria, VA 22333		12. REPORT DATE 1 February 1982
		13. NUMBER OF PAGES 74
14. MONITORING AGENCY NAME & ADDRESS(if different from Controlling Office) --		15. SECURITY CLASS. (of this report) UNCLASSIFIED
		15a. DECLASSIFICATION/DOWNGRADING SCHEDULE

16. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of this Report)

Approved for public release; distribution unlimited.

17. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abstract entered in Block 20, if different from Report)

--

18. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES

--

19. KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number)

Assessment; Assessment center; Officer selection; Performance-based assessment; Precommissioning program; Simulation; Training; Management skills; Army ROTC; Interpersonal skills; Leadership skills

20. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number)

One of the recommendations from the report A Review of Education and Training for Officers (RETO) was to develop a performance-based assessment program to gauge the leadership potential of applicants to Army precommissioning programs. The program was developed in three phases. First, an analysis was performed to identify the behavioral dimensions of the Second Lieutenant job. Second, simulations designed to elicit behaviors on these dimensions were prepared. Also developed in the second phase were the workbooks, training

DD FORM 1 JAN 73 1473 EDITION OF 1 NOV 65 IS OBSOLETE

UNCLASSIFIED

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE (When Data Entered)

Item 20. (continued)

manuals and texts necessary for assessor training and for administration of assessment centers. Finally, field tests were conducted in ROTC and Officer Candidate School to evaluate program contents and design.

The job analysis identified 12 dimensions of leadership. These dimensions were oral communication, oral presentation, written communication, influencing others, initiative, sensitivity, planning and organizing, delegation, administrative control, problem analysis, judgment and decisiveness. Based on the job analysis, five simulations were developed: an in-basket exercise, conduct of an interview, a scheduling exercise, an oral presentation, and a leaderless group discussion. Associated workbooks, materials and films were also developed for officers responsible for conducting and administering the Leadership Assessment Program.

Accession For
NTIS GRA&I ☒
DTIC TAB ☐
Unannounced ☐
Justification
By
Distribution/
Availability Codes
Dist | Avail and/or Special
A

Technical Report 560

DEVELOPMENT OF THE PRECOMMISSIONING LEADERSHIP ASSESSMENT PROGRAM

Robert W. Rogers, Leonard W. Lilley, Richard S. Wellins
Development Dimensions International

M. A. Fischl and William P. Burke
Army Research Institute

Submitted by:
T. Owen Jacobs, Chief
LEADERSHIP AND MANAGEMENT TECHNICAL AREA

Approved by:
Joyce L. Shields, Director
MANPOWER AND PERSONNEL
RESEARCH LABORATORY

U.S. ARMY RESEARCH INSTITUTE FOR THE BEHAVIORAL AND SOCIAL SCIENCES
5001 Eisenhower Avenue, Alexandria, Virginia 22333

Office, Deputy Chief of Staff for Personnel
Department of the Army

February 1982

Army Project Number
2Q263731A792

Manpower and Personnel

Approved for public release; distribution unlimited.

ARI Research Reports and Technical Reports are intended for sponsors of R&D tasks and for other research and military agencies. Any findings ready for implementation at the time of publication are presented in the last part of the Brief. Upon completion of a major phase of the task, formal recommendations for official action normally are conveyed to appropriate military agencies by briefing or Disposition Form.

FOREWORD

The five-volume document entitled "Review of Education and Training for Officers" (RETO) was produced in 1978 by an officer study group appointed by the Army Chief of Staff to examine and analyze the developmental training that officers receive throughout their careers. Several recommendations from the review were related to precommissioning selection and training. This product is part of an effort to develop an instrument for the Army's precommissioning programs.

The Leadership Assessment Program is the performance-based component of a selection/training system and consists of a series of job simulations designed to assess leadership potential. It is part of a continuing effort by the Army Research Institute to construct accurate selection and development instruments for officers. Work was performed by personnel from the Leadership and Management Technical Area under Army Project 2Q263731A792, in response to special requirements of the U.S. Army Training and Doctrine Command's Deputy Chief of Staff for ROTC.

EDGAR M. JOHNSON
Technical Director

DEVELOPMENT OF THE PRECOMMISSIONING LEADERSHIP ASSESSMENT PROGRAM

BRIEF

Requirement:

To develop a performance-based assessment program designed to gauge the potential of future officers in decision-making, supervisory skills, organizational leadership, communication skills, and other dimensions of leadership in the military.

Procedure:

The program was developed in three phases. First, an analysis was performed to identify the behavioral dimensions of the Second Lieutenant job. Second, simulations designed to elicit behaviors on these dimensions were prepared. Also developed in the second phase were the workbooks, training manuals and texts necessary for assessor training and for administration of assessment centers. Finally, field tests were conducted in ROTC and Officer Candidate School to evaluate program contents and design.

Findings:

The job analysis identified twelve dimensions of leadership. These dimensions were oral communication, oral presentation, written communication, influencing others, initiative, sensitivity, planning and organizing, delegation, administrative control, problem analysis, judgment and decisiveness. Based on the job analysis, five simulations were developed: an in-basket exercise, conduct of an interview, a scheduling exercise, an oral presentation, and a leaderless group discussion. Associated workbooks, materials and films were also developed for officers responsible for conducting and administering the Leadership Assessment Program.

Utilization of Findings:

The Leadership Assessment Program has been implemented on a trial basis in nine ROTC detachments for school year 1980-81 and is planned for broader implementaton in ROTC and OCS beginning in Autumn 1982.

PRECEDING PAGE BLANK-NOT FILMED

DEVELOPMENT OF THE PRECOMMISSIONING LEADERSHIP ASSESSMENT PROGRAM

CONTENTS

	Page
INTRODUCTION	1
THE ASSESSMENT CENTER METHOD	3
JOB ANALYSIS	11
PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT	19
FINAL LEADERSHIP ASSESSMENT PROGRAM	23
SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	26
REFERENCES	27
APPENDIXES	
Appendix A. Incumbent Questionnaire	29
B. Critical Incident Questionnaire	41
C. Dimension Selection Questionnaire	55
D. Assessee Final Report Format	63
E. Assessee Reactions, First Field Test	65
F. Assessor Reactions, First Field Test	67
G. OCS Assessee Reactions, Second Field Test	69
H. OCS Assessor Reactions, Second Field Test	71
TABLES	
Table 1. Assessment Center Comparisons	8
2. Content Validity Ratio for Thirteen Dimensions	17
3. Definitions of Dimensions to be Assessed	18
4. Dimensions by Exercise	19

PRECEDING PAGE BLANK-NOT FILMED

DEVELOPMENT OF THE PRECOMMISSIONING LEADERSHIP ASSESSMENT PROGRAM

INTRODUCTION

The Precommissioning Leadership Assessment Program (LAP) is a performance-based assessment program designed to gauge the potential of future officers in decision-making, supervisory skills, organizational skills, communication skills, and other dimensions of leadership in the military.

Background

In August 1977, the Chief of Staff of the U.S. Army established a Study Group for the Review of Education and Training for Officers. The group was tasked with performing a comprehensive review of officer training and education based on Army missions and individual career needs. After approximately one year's analysis, the five-volume report, entitled A Review of Education and Training for Officers (RETO), was published. The report contained several recommendations, later approved by the Chief of Staff, for change in the precommissioning screening of officer program applicants. One of the changes was to utilize a performance-based assessment program to help gauge the leadership potential of future officers. This report describes the development of that program.

History of Performance-Based Assessment

Performance-based assessment consists of an integrated system of simulations or exercises designed to generate behavior similar to that required for success on a target job or job level. In essence, it is a miniature job sample in which the assessee is observed by multiple assessors.

The use of behavioral simulations to test skills and abilities is not a new concept. The Germans used a series of simulations to select high-level officers during World War I. The British later adopted the procedure and are still using assessment methodology to select candidates into their Officer Corps.

During World War II, the Office of Strategic Services (OSS) in the United States applied the assessment methodology in an attempt to identify which applicants would make the best spies or intelligence agents. Candidates were put through a rigorous testing procedure which included both physical and mental exercises to determine their capabilities (MacKinnon, 1974).

The first recorded use of the assessment process in industry occurred in the late 1950s at AT&T. There, a longitudinal study was conducted on 274 managers during their first eight years of employment. The assessment process was used to evaluate skill levels during their first days at AT&T and then again at the eight year point in their careers. The results showed that the assessment evaluations were accurate predictors of success within the AT&T system (Bray, Campbell and Grant, 1974).

However, the growth and widespread use of the assessment concept in industry and government did not start until the early 1970s. The Civil Rights Act of 1964 and the establishment of government agencies to regulate and monitor employment practices of companies in the late 1960s and early 1970s caused many organizations to re-examine their employment practices from the point of view of court-defined fairness. One outcome of this was increased reliance on assessment procedures using job simulations, which had generally been upheld in court precedents, to assist in determining which individuals were best qualified for the positions. Large companies such as Sears Roebuck and Company, IBM, General Electric, Standard Oil (SOHIO), General Motors, J.C. Penney, and AT&T were the first groups to use the assessment process as part of their selection or promotion systems. As a result of their descriptions of success with the procedure, more and more companies within American industry began to utilize the process. Today, over 2,000 companies and government organizations are using the assessment process to assist decision-makers in making better selection or promotion decisions and to aid in identifying individual management development needs (Byham, 1980).

The U.S. military also has contemporary experience in the use of assessment centers. In the early 1960's, a large assessment center was established at Fort McClellan, Alabama, to afford criterion data for validating officer selection test batteries. In 1973, the Army established a pilot program at Fort Benning to determine the feasibility of the assessment center approach for officer selection and development. The U.S. Air Force uses similar assessment procedures for leadership development at its Squadron Officer School, Maxwell Air Force Base, Alabama. Similarly, the assessment method is used as an organizational effectiveness tool for incoming company commanders at Fort Carson, Colorado. In addition, Brigadier General designates are offered the opportunity to go through a special assessment process before they assume their high-level command and staff positions. Finally, other Army agencies or schools exploring the use of assessment centers include the Army War College, Command and General Staff College, Recruiting Command, and an Officer Advanced Course at Fort Benjamin Harrison, Indiana.

Outline of Report

This report covers the activities associated with the development of the precommissioning leadership assessment program and is divided into three main sections. The traditional assessment center method is described in detail in the first section and compared to the modified method which was developed for the Leadership Assessment Program. The specifics of the job analysis, which was conducted to determine the appropriate behavioral dimensions to be measured in the assessment program, are covered in the second section. The chronology and specifics of the development of the Leadership Assessment Program are covered in the third section.

THE ASSESSMENT CENTER METHOD

In this section, the components of a standard assessment center are described in detail. The specifications for the Precommissioning Leadership Assessment Program (LAP) are also described and their deviations from standard assessment centers are indicated.

Standard Assessment Center Method

Writing on the assessment center method, Moses has stated that "an assessment center can be thought of as both a place and a process. It is a place where individuals participate in a variety of measurement techniques. It is also a process designed to provide standardized and objective conditions of evaluation" (1977, p.4). Moses continues:

> The strength of the assessment center method is two-fold. First, it uses techniques designed to simulate critical behaviors related to success on the job. It then facilitates the integration of this information by pooling data from a variety of assessment sources.
>
> A typical assessment center usually brings a group of six to 12 individuals together. These individuals participate in a variety of exercises and techniques designed to measure predetermined qualities or abilities. These techniques include group exercises, business games, in-basket exercises, pencil-and-paper tests, and interviews. They may also include specifically designed role-playing problems, phone calls, or simulated interviews.
>
> Reports are prepared describing the assessment outcome. Depending on the intent of the center, these reports can contain diagnostic information concerning a participant's strengths and weaknesses, or simply a statement predicting the participant's potential for success in a more demanding position.
>
> Performance by participants in the assessment center process is observed by a trained team of evaluators. These individuals usually are representatives of the organization who are knowledgeable about the kinds of behavior found to be effective. These evaluators, or assessors, receive special training and participate as members of the assessment team.
>
> Each assessor has several key functions to perform. He or she must conduct the assessment exercises and observe participant performance during this part of the process. The assessor must also report on what behaviors were observed to other members of the evaluation team and then

judge, along with other members of the assessment team, the effectiveness of the behaviors noted. While the length of training varies from center to center, all assessors receive special instructions concerning these aspects of the process.

An assessment center can also be defined as a sophisticated rating process designed to minimize as many forms of potential rater bias as possible. Each participant is given the same opportunity to demonstrate his or her abilities in standardized situations.

There are sufficient assessors available so that each participant is observed by more than one judge. The process requires that independent judgments of behaviors and effectiveness be made. Multiple observers, multiple sources of information, and specifically defined objective dimensions of performance all add to the objectivity of the process. . . .

Regardless of the intent of the assessment center itself, the following aspects are present in each assessment center. These components consist first of a list of qualities or dimensions related to the characteristics sought in the position or job level in question. A second component consists of a series of techniques designed to provide information useful in evaluating these qualities or dimensions. The final component is a staff to administer the assessment process as well as to interpret the behaviors observed.

The Dimensions to be Assessed

Obviously, the dimensions or qualities to be evaluated are critical factors. These vary depending upon the purpose of the assessment center, the kinds of skills and abilities evaluated, and the level within the organization of the participant and assessor. For example, in an assessment center designed to evaluate potential for further advancement, the qualities or dimensions typically evaluated are heavily weighed toward management abilities such as leadership, communication skills, and decision-making administrative-type skills. On the other hand, assessment centers designed for individual development strategies focus on areas that can be amenable to change and may include such aspects as personal career-planning strategies and increased self-awareness based on feedback associated with the assessment. In all cases, however, determining the kinds of qualities or dimensions to be evaluated is a critical factor in establishing an assessment center. Generally, these dimensions should be ones that are stable and do not

change rapidly over time, are observable using assessment center techniques, can be definable and meaningfully interpreted, and make sense to the organization.

There are a variety of methods used for defining the dimensions to be assessed. A job analysis, designed to determine critical behaviors in the position in question, is often needed. Dimensions found to be particularly successful in other assessment center programs are also often drawn upon. Often there is a great deal of similarity in management functions across organizations; consequently, we can expect to see some overlap in dimensions assessed in different organizations.

For the most part, however, a typical center evaluates from eight to 25 different dimensions. These may include such diverse skill areas as interpersonal, administrative, and communications effectiveness. Commonly used dimensions include leadership, persuasiveness, perception, flexibility, decisiveness, organizing and planning skills, problem-solving skills, and oral and written communications skills.

Assessment Techniques

The techniques used to measure these qualities also vary. As a general rule, no single technique is designed to provide information on all of the dimensions typically evaluated in an assessment center. Considerable research has indicated that certain techniques provide information highly relevant to specific dimensions. For example, measuring an individual's intellectual abilities is best done using standardized mental tests. Trying to evaluate this dimension, based on prior scholastic accomplishments or current writing skills, is generally much less accurate. Similarly, the most effective way of evaluating interpersonal kinds of behaviors requires a live, interpersonal interaction with others. Asking the individual to respond, for example, to the kinds of leadership approaches he or she may prefer in a given setting is not as realistic as simulating an actual situation which requires leadership capabilities. Consequently, various group exercises and games have been developed to measure these kinds of abilities. Administrative skills, such as organizing, planning, and decision-making, are best evaluated through a special individual exercise known as an in-basket. . . .

The Assessment Staff

The final component of an assessment center is the staff itself. In many respects, this is one of the most critical components of the process. Since assessment is a judgmental process, the quality of the judge is of great

importance. The assessor must be able to assimilate a great deal of information rapidly, must be relatively free of personal biases, and must be perceived by his or her organization as an effective individual. This last factor is of great importance in terms of how the results of the program are used. If the organization perceives the assessment staff as marginal, then it will tend to ignore the results of the process. On the other hand, if assessors represent the best that the organization has to offer, the results of the process take on greater signficance.

Many centers use special selection techniques for assessors. It is also not uncommon to see assessors drawn from prior successful assessment participants.

As noted earlier, there are wide variations in terms of the staffing approaches used by different organizations. The background of the assessor, training of the assessor, and judgmental strategies employed by the assessor are [important considerations].

Perhaps an example at this point would be appropriate to show the intent of the assessment center process. Suppose, for a moment, that you were asked to identify an individual whose major responsibility will be speaking to audiences on a variety of topics. Obviously, one of the dimensions to be observed for this position is the extent to which the individual can make an effective oral presentation. This is but one dimension of many which may be relevant but, for our example, it is the one considered.

There are several ways of determining whether or not a candidate is suitable for this assignment. One common method is simply to ask the applicant for a self-report. For example, you might determine whether the individual does have prior speaking experience. The applicant might be asked whether he or she is comfortable in addressing large groups, whether he or she has had prior public speaking training, and so forth. While this might be relevant and useful background information, it does not help in determining the skills of the candidate in question. As an alternative approach, you could obtain reference/appraisal-type data about the speaking skills of the applicant. For example, you could solicit the opinion of a manager who may have heard the individual make an oral presentation. This kind of data gathering is quite common for many management selection decisions. Obviously, it suffers from considerable bias based on the original opportunities presented to the candidate as well as the frame of reference of the evaluator.

A third method would combine some of the information from the first two approaches with observations made during the interview of the individual Again, this is a common and easily administered procedure. This method is useful in predicting only those behaviors that are present both in an interview setting and in addressing a large group. For example, knowing that candidate is poised in a face-to-face interview setting does not guarantee that he or she will behave similarly in front of a large audience.

While all of the above approaches are widely used, none of these approaches really addresses the question at hand. Realistically, the best way of evaluating whether an individual can make an effective oral presentation is simply to put him or her in the situation under standardized conditions and observe how effectively the individual makes the actual presentation. In this setting, specific attention should be given to the method and manner of presentation, the content of ideas, audience attentiveness, and a host of other related evaluative behaviors. This, in the long run, will be a much more accurate prediction of effectiveness than any of the preceding methods.

In a similar manner, other kinds of skills are evaluated in an assessment center. Exercises are designed to simulate critical behaviors related to job success. A variety of techniques are used, leading to a wealth of data that can then be used for evaluative purposes (pp. 4-8).[1]

An Analysis of Army Assessment Environment

The Leadership Assessment Program was envisioned as encompassing all the basic components of the standard assessment center method while operating in the Army officer training environment. The most serious constraint was its location on 288 different college and university campuses. A review of this environment showed wide variation from detachment to detachment concerning time available for cadet assessment and availability of cadre personnel for assessment duties. These factors received consideration in the design of the LAP.

The size of ROTC faculty dictated that the assessor/assessee ratio be one to three instead of the usual one to two found in standard assessment centers. Also, exercises were shortened somewhat to be administrable in a fifty-minute classroom schedule if necessary. Other adjustments, dictated primarily by the time availability of cadre personnel, included: reducing the number of exercises used in standard assessment centers from six to five and modifying the standard final report to two pages from the standard ten pages.

---

[1] Reprinted, with permission, from Moses and Byham, 1977, Pergamon Press.

A comparison of characteristics of standard assessment centers and the Precommissioning Leadership Assessment Program is shown in Table 1.

Table 1
ASSESSMENT CENTER COMPARISONS

Item	Standard Assessment Center	LAP Assessment Center
Assessor Training	5 Day Classroom	2-1/2 Day Self Study 2-1/2 Day Classroom
Length of Assessment	14 Hours	8 Hours
Number of Exercises	6	5
Number of Assessees per Group	6	6
Number of Assessors per Group	3	2
Final Report	10-14 Pages	2 Pages

Staff Training

A critical element in the design and development of the Leadership Assessment Program was the associated training program for those personnel designated to test and, later, implement the program. Absolutely essential to the successful application and execution of the assessment process in any organizational setting--industrial or government--is the firm requirement for individuals highly trained in assessor skills.

The organizational design for the adminstration of the LAP within the ROTC environment identified three categories of individuals with different training requirements: assessors, program administrators, and master trainers.

Assessors - The training required to develop the skills necessary to serve effectively as an assessor includes:

- Developing a thorough understanding of the behavioral simulations used in this program.
- Recognizing specific examples of behaviors as compared to vague, judgmental observations.

- Developing the skill of recording observations rapidly and in specific terms of the behaviors observed.

- Understanding how to properly categorize behaviors under appropriate dimensions.

- Becoming familiar with the five point rating scale used in this program and understanding the standards against which participant performance is measured.

- Getting instruction in how to prepare an assessor report on the assessee's performance in each of the exercises.

- Receiving information on the conduct of an assessor data integration session.

- Planning for and conducting feedback interviews.

A detailed LAP Assessor Training Guide was developed. This manual was made available to assessor trainees prior to the commencement of classroom training. Approximately two and one-half days of self-study were required prior to the commencement of classroom training, which also lasted two and one-half days.

Program Administrators - Program Administrator training included:

- The history of assessment centers.
- The validity base for the assessment method.
- The procedures used in the assessment program.
- How the dimensions were developed.
- The dimensional rating scale.

In addition, the program administrators received training required to develop their ability to:

- Plan for an assessment program implementation.
- Train assessors.
- Effectively utilize assessor training aids and materials to maximize impact of assessor training.
- Evaluate assessor-trainee skills.
- Conduct an assessor discussion.
- Rate performance in exercises by dimension consistent with pre-established standards.
- Conduct feedback of assessment results to assessees.

Master Trainers - The LAP Master Trainers' responsibilities included two major functions: (a) the training of administrators for each detachment within their regions, (b) the quality control and monitoring of detachment programs. In addition to receiving assessor and administrator training, the Master Trainers received training in how to:

- Prepare and plan for administrator training.
- Develop an administrator training schedule.
- Provide feedback to trainees.
- Establish quality control and monitor programs within detachments.

Training Materials - Five manuals, three videotapes, and a set of transparencies were prepared and constitute the training materials necessary for LAP assessor, administrator, and master trainer training and for the administration of the assessment program within the ROTC environment.

The manuals are:

- Program Administrator Manual
- Master Trainer Manual
- Assessor Training Guide
- Assessor Workbook
- In-Basket Manual

The videotapes are:

- Maintenance Review Board (Group Discussion)
- Oral Presentation and Counseling Simulation
- Giving Assessment Feedback

In implementing the staff training program, the following steps were accomplished:

1. Seven ROTC instructors were trained in assessor skills and used as assessors in the first field test of the program.

2. Five Officer Candidate School (OCS) instructors were trained in assessor skills and used as assessors in the second field test of the program.

3. Twenty-four ROTC instructors were trained in assessor skills and used as assessors in the third and major field test of the program.

4. For the final testing of the program in nine colleges/universities nationally, one individual from each institution received assessor training and administrator training. This training was provided in Alexandria, Virginia, during the period June 9-18, 1980.

5. One member of each of the four ROTC regional staffs, plus an additional member of the second ROTC region staff, were designated Master Trainers and received the additional training necessary for this designation.

6. Administrator/Master Trainer training at all locations was conducted by the LAP project staff.

JOB ANALYSIS

A job analysis was conducted to determine the behavioral dimensions of the Second Lieutenant position.

Method

Review Existing Literature. The first step in the job analysis procedure was to review a broad array of research and other Army publications to obtain background information on the scope and depth of Second Lieutenant job responsibilities and activities in today's Army. This research served as the basis for the construction of an incumbent interview questionnaire (See Appendix A). This questionnaire was designed so that the interviewer could ask questions of Second Lieutenants like: "Describe your position in the organization. What are your major job duties? Describe your typical day. What are the most difficult parts of a Second Lieutenant's job?"

Incumbent Interviews. The next step in the job analysis procedure was to conduct incumbent interviews. In October, 1979, a team composed of four interviewers traveled to Fort Lewis, Washington, and conducted incumbent interviews with Lieutenants in the Ninth Infantry Division. Of the twenty-eight Lieutenants, twelve were from combat arms, eleven from combat support, and five from combat services support.

The principal reason for interviewing incumbents was to learn how the incumbent spent his/her time; what the biggest problems were; and what procedures, knowledges and skills were required in the job. Some information on the causes of success and failure in the job was also obtained, but this was of secondary importance due to the limited perspective that incumbents brought to that task.

Critical Incident Interviews. Following the interviews with Lieutenants, four groups of five Captains each, also from the Ninth Infantry Division, were interviewed. The Captains were all company commanders or had served as company commanders and represented all branches. The purpose of these interviews was to obtain another perspective--this one from individuals who had all served in the target position as well as supervised individuals in the target position. Meeting in groups of five, with one interviewer posing questions, the Captains were asked to describe situations they had observed in which individuals had been particularly successful or unsuccessful in the target position. Using the critical incident questionnaire (Appendix B) as a guide, the interviewer asked such questions as: "Think of an incident indicating outstanding performance in a Second Lieutenant position. Describe the situation, the behavior, and the consequence."; "What do you see as the three major functions or responsibilities of a Second Lieutenant?".

Analysis of Job Activity and Critical Incident Data. The next task in the job analysis sequence of activities was to convert these two sets of data into a tentative list of behavioral dimensions. Activity data were distilled from the interview notes, and rough counts of frequency of mention were obtained. The more frequent activities were then categorized into a list of dimensions. Critical incident data were analyzed and another list of

dimensions was distilled from the incidents cited. Analysts employed the following rules in developing the list of dimensions from critical incidents:

1. They looked for truly critical incidents; that is, examples of unusually effective or unusually ineffective performance.

2. There had to be at least three critical incidents involving any one dimension before it could be included on the list.

3. They considered both the frequency and importance of the behavior cited.

Next, both lists of dimensions produced from analysis of the activity and critical incident data were combined into one tentative list of dimensions. Full definitions of the dimensions were developed along with clarifying information designed to assist those working with the dimensions to better understand why they were included on the list.

The tentative list of dimensions, with supporting rationale and organized by category, was as indicated below:

Communication Skills

Oral Communication Skill: Effective expression in individual or group situations (includes gestures and nonverbal communication).

Lieutenants must communicate with their NCOs and other members of their platoons in giving orders, answering questions, and providing task performance feedback. They conduct meetings with their NCOs and participate in meetings run by the company commander and others. They keep the unit commander up-to-date on platoon activities and other unit problems that arise. They work with other officers and NCOs to meet the needs of their unit. Effective communication during these interactions is crucial to ensure complete understanding.

The focus of this dimension is on the clarity and form of the communication, not the content. Typical communication areas of concern are: clarity, volume, grammar, eye contact, rate, inflection/modulation, organization, enthusiasm, confidence, brevity and nonverbal communication such as gestures, facial expressions, etc.

Written Communication Skill: Expressing ideas clearly in writing using good grammatical form.

Lieutenants are frequently required to express themselves in writing in a variety of circumstances. They are required to submit reports on the status of training in their platoons, prepare replies to inspection reports, submit promotion recommendations, and write on other similar matters. They also prepare, in writing, performance evaluations on the NCOs in their platoons, memos, and letters to unit commanders and, sometimes, to other senior officers. As a result, the ability to write clearly is an essential skill for lieutenants.

Oral Presentation Skill: Effective expression when presenting ideas or tasks to an individual or to a group when given time for preparation (includes gestures and nonverbal communication).

The important distinction between oral communication skill and oral presentation skill is the phrase "given time for preparation." For the lieutenant, oral presentation situations include presentations to senior officers and/or subordinates on a variety of subjects such as the status of unit effectiveness. These presentations are usually one-on-one or to small groups. The presentations can be made standing up with visual aids or at the desk. Also, they can be made either under garrison or field circumstances. Oral presentation also includes the ability to field questions following a presentation.

Other important elements of oral presentation skill are: pitching the presentation at the appropriate level for the audience; reacting appropriately to audience concerns; and gaining commitment and acceptance, when appropriate. The lieutenant must project a knowledgeable, professional image. Similar areas of concern as listed under oral communication skill are also considered. In addition, the opening and closing of the presentation as well as the rapport established are crucial, and use of visual aids are evaluated.

Personal/Motivational Skills

Initiative: Active attempts to influence events to achieve goals; self-starting rather than passive acceptance. Taking action to achieve goals beyond those called for; originating action.

Lieutenants frequently work without close supervision from a superior officer, particularly in field situations. Inherent in this situation is the job of leading a military unit and the need to originate and sometimes take actions that go beyond specific job responsibilities. Lieutenants need to be initiators and originators instead of just reacting to events. A lieutenant should take action as soon as a problem begins developing and not wait until someone else suggests that the situation needs attention. This is particularly true in the field where major initiatives are frequently needed to accomplish unit objectives. The innovative lieutenant goes beyond word-to-word content of orders and takes action to improve unit efficiency.

Interpersonal Skills

Sensitivity: Actions that indicate a consideration for the feelings and needs of others.

The lieutenant needs to take actions based on an accurate appraisal of the feelings, competencies, and needs of others, particularly the NCOs and personnel of his/her unit. An accurate perception of how others see him/her is also important. A lieutenant must take subordinates' feelings into consideration during one-on-one meetings especially when disciplining or examining problem performance. He/she must be able to smooth over relations among subordinates as well as between subordinates and officers/NCOs from

other units. He/she must also freely acknowledge assistance from subordinates/superiors and other individuals and take actions which consider subordinates' feelings when resolving complaints.

Influence: Utilizing appropriate interpersonal styles and methods in guiding individuals (subordinates, peers, superiors) or groups toward task accomplishment.

Lieutenant positions require individuals who must be able to lead others toward accomplishing unit goals. It is expected that these individuals must be able to adopt an interpersonal style commensurate with the situation. The focus is not only on the effect of the attempts to persuade people to change, but also on the means employed to achieve these changes. Despite lack of experience, the lieutenant must be able to motivate, guide, or inspire the members of his/her unit toward accomplishing unit goals. Likewise, in interactions with peers and/or superiors, the lieutenant needs to be persuasive in getting his/her ideas adopted. He/she must set an example for all subordinates and must be able to coach, train and counsel subordinates in job responsibilities and personal problems.

Administrative Skills

Planning and Organizing: Establishing a course of action for self and/or others to accomplish a specific goal; planning proper assignments of personnel and appropriate allocation of resources.

Lieutenants must plan and organize for themselves and others. They often have to prepare task assignments for members of their units according to importance and urgency. They must assign tasks to NCOs or other members of their units, as appropriate, and reschedule priorities and assignments due to unforeseen problems. They must take actions to meet suspense for reports or other needs of the organization. They must manage their own time to make effective use of available time and allocate resources necessary for the accomplishment of assigned unit tasks.

Delegation: Utilizing subordinates effectively. Allocating decision-making and other responsibilities to the appropriate subordinates.

Most lieutenant positions require individuals who can effectively allocate work to their subordinates. There are many facets to the delegation dimension. It includes what is delegated (type of task, authority, or information gathering); how it is delegated (clarity and specificity of the delegation); and the target of the delegation (is it the most appropriate person). All of these factors are important and must be considered in evaluating delegation effectiveness.

Administrative Control: Establishing procedures to monitor and/or regulate processes, tasks or activities of subordinates, and job activities and responsibilities. Taking action to monitor the results of delegated assignments or projects.

Lieutenants must take action to establish controls over procedures or methods for accomplishing unit work tasks and activities. The most frequent monitoring device employed by lieutenants is direct observation. However, provisions for feedback such as weekly reports or daily meetings with NCOs are also of use. Lieutenants must follow up on orders given to subordinates, and must monitor the progress, activities and achievements of their units to make sure they are completed within the established time frame.

Decision-Making Skills

Problem Analysis: Identifying problems, securing relevant information, relating data from different sources, and determining possible causes of problems.

Lieutenants are faced with a myriad of problems at unit level which they must have the skill to solve. They must be able to correctly identify existing surface as well as underlying problems. Secondly, they must possess the skill and knowledge to recognize and collect pertinent information critical to the problem. Third, they must possess the skill to accurately analyze the information relative to the problem. Finally, they must be able to correctly identify the cause of the problem and possible potential problems that could occur if the immediate problem is not solved. Examples of problems encountered by the lieutenant are decreasing unit morale, failure to achieve unit training goals, and physical security.

Judgment: Developing alternative courses of action and making decisions which are based on logical assumptions and reflect factual information.

Lieutenants are required to make decisions on a daily basis. Judgment reflects the degree to which people use the information they are given or have obtained, develop alternative courses of action, perceive the appropriateness of the actions open to them, understand the pros and cons of each alternative, and choose the most appropriate alternative. For example, lieutenants have to know when to accept recommendations from subordinates in both garrision and field situations.

Decisiveness: Readiness to make decisions, render judgments, take action, or commit oneself.

Lieutenants are required to make many decisions, some of which may involve the welfare of their subordinates. They need to be able to determine how many facts are needed in a given situation before making a decision. The officer position requires individuals who will make a decision, given sufficient information, and not needlessly seek or wait for further information.

Technical Skills

Technical Competence: Level of understanding and ability to use technical/professional information.

Lieutenants must acquire all current technical information and doctrine which is relevant to the position and apply this knowledge to direct the unit in both tactical and non-tactical situations. Examples of skills and knowledges include map reading, equipment maintenance, and weapon use.

Dimension Questionnaire. The tentative list of the thirteen dimensions described above was next placed in questionnaire form (see Appendix C). This questionnaire was administered to 40 Captains at each of Forts Benning, Georgia; Sill, Oklahoma; and Knox, Kentucky. Respondents were requested to rate each dimension as to its importance for success as a Second Lieutenant. The rating scale used was as follows:

4 - Absolutely essential. A person could not possibly perform satisfactorily in the job without a high degree of skill in this area.

3 - Essential. It would be very difficult for a person to perform satisfactorily in the job without considerable skill in this area.

2 - Useful, but not essential. Skill in this area would sometimes enhance job performance, but satisfactory performance could be expected without it.

1 - Unnecessary. Skill in this area would almost never have anything to do with satisfactory job performance.

Final Analysis. Eighty-nine responses to the dimension questionnaire were received from the Captain sample. Analysts next computed the content validity ratio for each dimension.

In a paper presented at Content Validity II, a conference held at Bowling Green University, July 18, 1975[2], C.H. Lawshe stated that:

> When all panelists (questionnaire respondents) say that the test knowledge or skill is "essential" or when none say that it is "essential", we can have confidence that the knowledge or skill is or is not truly essential, as the case might be. It is when the strength of the consensus moves away from unity and approaches fifty-fifty that problems arise. Two assumptions are made, each of which is consistent with established psychophysical principles:
>
> - Any item, performance on which is perceived to be "essential" by more than half of the panelists, has some degree of content validity.
>
> - The more panelists (beyond 50%) who perceive the item as "essential," the greater the extent or degree of its content validity.

To implement the above thinking, Lawshe proposed the following formula for a statistic he called the Content Validity Ratio (CVR):

$$CVR = \frac{n_e - N/2}{N/2}$$

[2]Also published in Lawshe, 1975.

in which the n_e is the number of panelists indicating "essential" and N is the total number of panelists. While the CVR is a direct linear transformation from the percentage saying "essential", its utility derives from its characteristics:

- When fewer than half say "essential" the CVR is negative
- When half say "essential" and half do not, the CVR is zero
- When all say "essential", the CVR is computed to be 1.00 (it is adjusted to .99 for ease of manipulation).
- When the number saying "essential" is more than half, but less than all, the CVR is somewhere between zero and .99.

Results: Employing the procedure described by Lawshe, content validity ratios for all thirteen dimensions are presented in Table 2. All of these values are reliably greater than zero ($p < 0.05$). The final outcomes of this analysis were (a) to delete the dimension of Technical Competence since applicants who are admitted to a precommissioning program will have ample opportunity to develop and be evaluated in technical skills during the course of their training; (b) to shorten working descriptions of the remaining twelve dimensions; and (c) to begin to prepare materials for assessing individuals on these dimensions. The final set is presented in Table 3.

Table 2
Content Validity Ratios for the Thirteen Dimensions, N=89

Dimension	Content Validity Ratio
Initiative	.91
Technical Competence	.89
Judgment	.87
Decisiveness	.82
Oral Communication Skill	.82
Planning and Organizing	.69
Influence	.66
Delegation	.64
Administrative Control	.64
Problem Analysis	.53
Written Communication Skill	.53
Sensitivity	.44
Oral Presentation Skill	.35

Table 3
Leadership Assessment Program
Definitions of Dimensions to be Assessed

Dimension	Definition
Oral Communication Skill:	Effective expression in individual or group situations (includes gestures and nonverbal communication).
Written Communication Skill:	Clear expression of ideas in writing and in good grammatical form.
Oral Presentation Skill:	Effective expression when presenting ideas or tasks to an individual or to a group when given time for preparation (includes gestures and nonverbal communication).
Influence:	Utilization of appropriate interpersonal styles and methods in guiding individuals (subordinates, peers, superiors) or groups toward task accomplishment.
Initiative:	Active attempts to influence events to achieve goals; self-starting rather than passive acceptance. Taking action to achieve goals beyond those called for; originating action.
Sensitivity:	Actions that indicate a consideration for the feelings and needs of others.
Planning and Organizing:	Establishing a course of action for self and/or others to accomplish a specific goal; planning proper assignments of personnel and appropriate allocation of resources.
Delegation:	Utilizing subordinates effectively. Allocating decision-making and other responsibilities to the appropriate subordinates.
Administrative Control:	Establishing procedures to monitor and/or regulate processes, tasks, or activities of subordinates, and job activities and responsibilities. Taking action to monitor the results of delegated assignments or projects.
Problem Analysis:	Identifying problems, securing relevant information, relating data from different sources and identifying possible causes of problems.
Judgment:	Developing alternative courses of action and making decisions which are based on logical assumptions and which reflect factual information.
Decisiveness:	Readiness to make decisions, render judgments, take action, or commit oneself.

PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT

Using the twelve dimensions identified in the job analysis as a foundation, the next step in development of the Precommissioning Leadership Assessment Program was to design and develop exercises. These exercises (simulations) would give assessees the opportunity to demonstrate skill levels in the twelve dimensions required in the Second Lieutenant position. During the development of the exercises, training materials needed for the assessors, administrators, and master trainers were being prepared. Finally, extensive field testing of exercises, texts, and training materials was completed before exporting the LAP to the university environments.

Exercise and Training Material Development. The first step in this phase was to select the types of behavioral exercises which would provide the applicants with as many opportunities as possible to demonstrate skill levels in each of the twelve dimensions. Two broad types of exercises were selected: an In-Basket and a Scheduling Exercise for eliciting administrative behaviors, and a Counseling Simulation and a Leaderless Group Discussion for eliciting interpersonal behaviors. In addition, an Oral Presentation was included. These exercises were selected since they offer maximum opportunity for observing behaviors in dimensions to be evaluated in the LAP. LAP dimensions by exercise are shown in Table 4.

Table 4
LAP Dimensions by Exercise

Dimension	Exercise				
	In-Basket	Scheduling Exercise	Counseling Simulation	Leaderless Group Discussion (Assigned Role)	Oral Presentation
Oral Communication			X	X	
Written Communication	X				
Oral Presentation					X
Influence			X	X	
Initiative	X			X	
Sensitivity	X		X	X	
Planning and Organizing	X	X			
Delegation	X				
Administrative Control	X				
Problem Analysis	X		X	X	
Judgment	X		X		
Decisiveness	X			X	

The five exercises place the participant in a realistic organizational situation and provide multiple opportunities for the participant to demonstrate behaviors in each of the targeted dimensions. The organizational setting varies from exercise to exercise but the assignment of the participant remains constant--that of a newly commissioned Second Lieutenant assigned to a troop unit.

First Field Test. The first field test of the Leadership Assessment Program was conducted at Fort Benning, Georgia, during the period April 7-16, 1980. ROTC instructors and cadets from the second and third ROTC regions participated in this field test.

The first phase of this field test, which was conducted in the facilities of the ARI Field Unit at Fort Benning, was assessor training. The project staff conducted this phase of the field test, training two Army Research Institute personnel, two Training and Doctrine Command personnel and seven ROTC personnel as assessors. Two noncommissioned officers were part of the ROTC complement. Training commenced on April 7. The first two days of training were devoted to trainees studying the Assessor Training Guide in the classroom. This was a departure from the normal schedule of self-study prior to classroom training. However, it was determined that for the first test of this manual, supervised study was necessary to ensure all participants were thoroughly familiar with manual contents prior to classroom training.

Also, it had been determined that the videotapes required for LAP assessor training would not be produced until after the second field test. Therefore, ROTC students from nearby Columbus College served as training subjects during this first field test. Assessor training was completed on April 11. On April 13, eighteen ROTC cadets participated in the first LAP assessment center.

These cadets were enrolled in the Army ROTC programs as MSIIs or MSIIIs (Military Science II and III--ROTC designations for ROTC programs offered in college sophomore and junior years). They were from the following institutions:

Georgia Institute of Technology, Atlanta, Georgia
North Georgia College, Dahlonega, Georgia
Fort Valley State College, Fort Valley, Georgia
Tuskegee Institute, Tuskegee, Alabama
Auburn University, Auburn, Alabama
Georgia State University, Atlanta, Georgia

Students were divided into three groups of six cadets each. Each group was observed by one team of two assessors (student to assessor ratio 3:1). Two groups had two assessor teams assigned, with one of the teams designated as a shadow team, observing the assessment center for training purposes only.

Two and one-half days were spent integrating the data collected on all eighteen ROTC students. Final reports were prepared on each cadet from these data. (See Appendix D for final report format.) Student evaluations of the LAP were prepared upon completion of exercises. Assessor evaluations of the LAP were prepared after data integration was completed and final reports prepared. Responses from both groups were very positive concerning the value of the program. Students indicated they felt personal benefit from

participating in the program. Assessors felt the program was very good in surfacing student strengths and weaknesses. They also felt the assessor training which they received would be very valuable in evaluating the performance of cadet/officer candidates in the future. A tabulation of assessee and assessor responses is found in Appendices E and D.

In addition to the written evaluations, an in-depth course critique was held on April 16, 1980. Each exercise was discussed in detail with particular attention placed on exercise face and content validity.

Program Modification: Based on the written evaluations plus verbal inputs from the course critique, the following program revisions were made:

1. The oral presentation, which was made by cadets in conjunction with the scheduling exercise, was deleted from this exercise. Students and assessors felt that reporting the results of the schedule was not realistic and did not challenge the participant's oral presentation abilities to a sufficient degree. It was agreed that requiring the assessees to make an oral presentation on the results of the Maintenance Review Board (leaderless group discussion-assigned role) would be more realistic and would give the assessees more of an opportunity to demonstrate their skill level in this dimension.

2. Two items were eliminated from the Second Lieutenant's in-basket since assessors felt that they were not representative of items commonly found in a Second Lieutenant's in-basket.

3. The options available to members of the Maintenance Review Board (group discussion--assigned role) were re-evaluated and brought more in balance with adjustments in the monetary amounts assigned to each option.

4. Several minor changes in the training manuals and assessor report forms were made to reflect the desires of test personnel.

All changes to texts and exercises were made prior to the second field test.

Second Field Test. The second field test of the Leadership Assessment Program was conducted at Fort Benning, Georgia, during the period May 5-16, 1980. Instructors and officer candidates from the 50th and 51st companies of the Officer Candidate School participated in this field test. A schedule of assessor training, candidate assessment, data integration and critique similar to that used in the first field test was followed. One exception was that candidates in this field test were scheduled to receive feedback on their respective strengths and weaknesses. ROTC students in the first field test did not receive feedback at the test site. Those who desired feedback received same by telephone from the ARI project director after the field test.

The first phase of this field test was conducted in facilities provided by the Officer Candidate School and involved assessor training. Six OCS instructors commenced assessor training on May 5, 1980 and five completed same, one dropping out because of an illness. Revised texts were used and the same procedures used in the first field test were followed. Officer candidates were used as training subjects in lieu of videotapes. Assessor training was completed on May 9, 1980.

On May 13, ten officer candidates participated in the second LAP assessment center. These candidates had commenced training at OCS on May 12 and were relieved from training duties on May 13 in order to participate in the Leadership Assessment Program assessment center. Students were divided into two groups of five officer candidates each. Each group was observed by one team of three assessors. The TRADOC project sponsor and the ARI project director performed assessor duties on one team, replacing the OCS instructor who dropped out of training because of illness. Other project staff personnel performed administrator duties with both groups of assessees.

Two days were spent in integrating the data and preparing final reports on the ten officer candidates. Each officer candidate received feedback on May 15 from a member of the assessor teams. Officer candidate evaluations were prepared upon completion of exercises. Assessor evaluations were prepared after data integration and final reports had been prepared. As in the first field test, responses from both groups regarding the value of the program were quite good. (See Appendices G and H).

An overall critique was held on May 16, 1980. Five OCS instructor/assessors provided feedback on the exercises, texts and training materials. Their written evaluations and verbal inputs served as a basis for further refinement and polish of the exercises and training materials. The most important changes to the exercises and training materials resulting from the second field test were:

1. The courses of action illustrating mandatory and additional dimensions in the in-basket manual received detailed attention with several additions and modifications adopted for certain in-basket items.

2. Certain options for members of the Maintenance Review Board were further revised.

3. Some items in the scheduling exercise were deleted and others added.

4. All training manuals and text materials were edited to incorporate the changes cited above.

Final Review. All changes to exercises and training materials resulting from the second field test and recommended by test personnel were reviewed by the full staff prior to final printing, collating and shipping of the complete LAP materials package to Fort Knox, Kentucky, for operational testing of the LAP at the ROTC Basic Summer Camp.

FINAL LEADERSHIP ASSESSMENT PROGRAM

This chapter presents a description of all elements of the LAP, which are five exercises, five manuals, three videotapes, and one set of transparencies.

Exercises:

In-Basket Exercise: The participant is asked to handle letters, notes, requests, etc. that have accumulated on a predecessor's desk. The participant must make decisions, delegate responsibility, write letters and reports, assign work, plan, organize, and schedule activities on the material in the in-basket. There are twenty-one items in the exercise.

Situation: The participant will assume the role of a Second Lieutenant reporting to his/her first unit and being assigned as a platoon leader. He/she will be placed under a time constraint situation with no communication with anyone who might be of assistance. The participant must complete action on all items in the time allowed (one and one-half hours).

Assigned-Role Leaderless Group Discussion Exercise: Six participants are placed in a competitive situation and are required to allocate funds and make other judgments on a variety of competing proposals. Participants are assigned a position or viewpoint to present to the other group members. Each participant has two tasks: 1) to convince the other members to accept his/her request for funds; and 2) to aid the group in making the best decision.

Situation: The participant must attend a special meeting of the Post Maintenance Review Board and present his/her unit's request for year-end maintenance funds. The Board's recommendations go to the Post Commander for final disposition. The discussion will last one hour and ten minutes.

The participant receives a list of three projects in his/her unit which require maintenance funds. He/she must decide whether to request funds for one or more of these projects and then make a request of the Maintenance Review Board, of which he/she is an acting member. Each of the other five members of the Board presents a request for funds. Since the Board only has $175,000 in funds to allocate and the total requests exceed this amount, the participant must convince the Board of the importance of funding his/her unit's project. At the same time, participants must keep in mind the best utilization of funds from an overall Post Commander's viewpoint.

Scheduling Exercise: The participant is asked to develop a work schedule for his/her unit. The schedule is to cover all requirements and be free of conflict.

Situation: In this exercise, the participant is to prepare a training schedule for the platoon. It must accommodate the numerous training and operational commitments placed upon the platoon.

A number of training requirements are levied on the unit, many conflicting with already established commitments from other higher authorities. A realistic schedule must be developed, free of conflict. The exercise will last for fifty minutes.

Counseling Simulation Exercise: In this exercise, the participant must interact with a subordinate on a one-to-one basis by planning and conducting a counseling session.

Situation: In this exercise, the participant again assumes the role of a Second Lieutenant who must meet with one of his squad leaders whose performance of duty has recently deteriorated. The squad leader formerly had been considered the best squad leader in the platoon. Background data provides clues as to the possible cause of the squad leader's problem.

The participant must determine the true cause of the problem and establish courses of action to solve the problem and improve the situation. Fifteen minutes are allocated for the session. The participant is allowed twenty minutes to prepare for the session.

Oral Presentation: The participant is asked to prepare and deliver a ten minute presentation to his company commander.

Situation: In this exercise the participant is allowed twenty minutes to prepare an oral presentation covering the results of the Maintenance Review Board (Assigned-Role Leaderless Group Discussion exercise). The presentation will be made to the simulated company commander of the participant.

Manuals:

Assessor Training Guide - This manual contains the background information on assessment technology and required assessor skills used in conjunction with the two and one-half day classroom training for assessors.

Assessor Workbook - This manual contains all exercises, participant report forms, and assessor report forms used in the Leadership Assessment Program.

In-Basket Manual - This manual is used by assessors to evaluate in-basket exercises. It contains each of the twenty-one in-basket items along with mandatory and additional dimensions with examples for each category.

Program Administrator Manual - This manual contains course and training outlines for administrator use in training assessors.

Master Trainer Manual - This manual is a guide to assist master trainers in the preparation for and conduct of administrator training. It also sets forth LAP quality control procedures.

Videotapes:

Maintenance Review Board (Group Discussion) - This fifty-minute videotape shows six ROTC students participating in the group discussion exercise as members of the Maintenance Review Board. Each presents a project(s) for funding, and vigorous discussion of fund allocation ensues.

Oral Presentation and Counseling Simulation - One participant of the Maintenance Review Board is shown presenting the results of the Maintenance Review Board to his company commander. The second part of this videotape shows a participant conducting a counseling session with a subordordinate. This videotape is twenty minutes in length.

Giving Assessment Feedback - This forty-four minute videotape presents the essential elements of information necessary for an assessor to properly provide assessment feedback. Positive models are shown of an assessor giving feedback to two assessees--one who is accepting the feedback and one who is resisting the feedback.

Transparencies:

T1	Definition of Performance-Based Assessment
T2	Contribution of Assessment
T3	Definition of Dimension
T4	Flow Chart of Assessment Process
T5	Present and Future Job Contrasts
T6	Assessor Skills
T7A-T7I	Model Assessor Report Form

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

This report describes the development of a performance-based assessment program designed to gauge the leadership potential of future Army officers. As explained, a three-phase process was used in developing the program. First, an extensive job analysis was performed to document and identify those behavioral dimensions necessary for effective performance at the Second Lieutenant level. A list of twelve dimensions, consistent with previous Army leadership research, were identified. Based on the analysis, a series of simulations designed to elicit leadership behaviors relative to each dimension were prepared. Supporting workbooks, films and training manuals were also developed. Finally, field tests were conducted to evaluate the applicability of the program in the Army environment.

Questionnaire data revealed the success of the program in terms of relevancy to the military environment and potential benefits. For example, officers and officer candidates alike rated the program as highly valuable, interesting and realistic. Officers trained as assessors indicated that the program would be useful in surfacing individual strengths and weaknesses, selecting candidates into precommissioning programs, and serving as leadership training.

Pending validation, the Leadership Assessment Program gives indications of providing the Army with a useful selection or development tool consistent with RETO recommendations. Validation is underway and will be reported in the future.

REFERENCES

Bray, D. W., Cambell, R. L. and Grant, D. L. Formative years in business. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1974.

Byham, W. C. The assessment center as an aid in management development: an update. Training and Development Journal, 1980, 35.

Department of the Army. A Review of Education and Training for Officers (RETO). Washington, D.C., 1978.

Lawshe, C. H. A quantitative approach to content validity. Personnel Psychology, 1975, 28, 563-575.

Mackinnon, D. W. How assessment centers got started in the United States. Pittsburgh, PA: Development Dimensions International, 1974.

Moses, J. L. The assessment center method. In J. L. Moses and W. C. Byham (Eds.), Applying the assessment center method. New York: Pergamon Press, 1977.

APPENDIX A. INCUMBENT QUESTIONNAIRE

JOB RELATEDNESS ANALYSIS

INCUMBENT INTERVIEW GUIDE

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

SECOND LIEUTENANT POSITIONS

Location: _____

Interview Date: _____

Incumbent: _____

Interviewer: _____

Protected Group Status: _____

OPEN THE INTERVIEW BY SAYING:

Hello, I'm _____ _____.
Name Department

I'm glad you could spare the time to talk with me. The purpose of our meeting is to provide the United States Army with good, current information about the job of a Second Lieutenant. We will use the information to help refine our selection and development procedures for Lieutenant positions. The best way to get this information is to speak with Second Lieutenants, and you have been selected as one of those from whom we will get information.

I'm going to be asking some questions and I'll take notes on this form so that I don't lose any of the important points. Your answers will be combined with the answers of all of the other Lieutenants we interview, so the answers you give will not be identified as yours in any report we make. You may speak in complete confidence. You may certainly see anything I put down on this form.

Do you have any questions? Let's begin.

1. What is your MOS? _____
2. What was the source of your commission? _____
3. How long have you been commissioned? _____
4. What is your present assignment? _____
5. How long have you been in your present assignment? _____

PRECEDING PAGE BLANK-NOT FILMED

6. Describe your position in the organization -- where you are in the organization structure (e.g., reporting relationship). What is the size and composition of your unit? How many people report to you directly, indirectly?

Let's draw an organization chart. You are here. To whom do you report?

How many others report to him/her?

How many people report to you?

Do they all have the same job title?

7. What are your major job duties?

What are your people tasks and responsibilities?

What are the situations and decisions on which you impact?

Are these duties daily weekly, monthly, annually?

8. Describe your "typical day."

(If no typical day, "How do you spend your time?")

What activities take up the most time?

How much can you control how your time is used?

9. What were your biggest problems or challenges when you initially came into the position? (Details)

Why? _____

How did you deal with them? _____

Have problems/challenges changed? _____

10. What are the most difficult parts of a Second Lieutenant's job?

Why are they difficult? _____

Examples? _____

11. What are the types and nature of the things you delegate?

What is delegated? _____

How? _____

To whom? _____

_____

How do you follow up on delegated items? _____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

12. How do you keep knowledgeable about the activities of your subordinates?

What control systems can you use? _____

_____

_____

Examples? _____

_____

13. What is the nature of planning required of you?

_____

Do you plan people's time? _____

_____

Their activities? _____

_____

Resources? _____

_____

_____

14. What kinds of situations provide the most stress for you?

_____

_____

Why is that? _____ _____

_____ _____

How often does that happen? _____

_____

15. What are the most difficult decisions you must make?

_____

Examples? _____

Others? _____

_____

Anything else? _____

_____

_____

_____

16. What kind of interactions do you have with your superiors?

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

17. What kind of interactions do you have with your subordinates?

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

18. What kinds of information do you have to analyze?

How difficult? _____

_____

Written/oral? _____

Frequency? _____

Importance? _____

Help? _____

19. Do you make stand-up presentations?

Formal/informal?

1:1 or group?

How many?

Can you prepare?

Visual aids?

20. How many reports, memos, and announcements which you have to act on do you receive in a typical day or typical week?

What types are they?

How important are they?

21. If someone would come into your job and do exceptionally well, what types of things would he/she do better than the average individual?

(Clarify)

(Pin down)

22. What type of technical skills are critical in doing your job?

23. Are there any special type of skills you might be called upon to exhibit in a field/combat situation?

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

24. Is there anything else about your job which I should know to really understand it?

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

THANK YOU FOR YOUR COOPERATION.

THE INFORMATION YOU GAVE ME WILL BE COMBINED WITH INFORMATION PROVIDED BY OTHER SECOND LIEUTENANTS BEING INTERVIEWED. FROM THIS INFORMATION, A LIST WILL BE PREPARED OF KEY THINGS THAT SECOND LIEUTENANTS DO. THIS LIST WILL BE INCORPORATED INTO FUTURE SELECTION AND TRAINING OF INDIVIDUALS FOR SECOND LIEUTENANT POSITIONS.

AGAIN, THANK YOU FOR YOUR HELP.

DO YOU HAVE ANY QUESTIONS?

APPENDIX B. CRITICAL INCIDENT QUESTIONNAIRE

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

JOB RELATEDNESS ANALYSIS

CRITICAL INCIDENT MEETING LEADER'S GUIDE

Date of Meeting: _____ Chairperson: _____

Time Began: _____

Time Ended: _____

Place: _____

Participants

Name	Title

PRECEDING PAGE BLANK-NOT FILMED

OPENING COMMENTS

Hello, I'm _____ _____
NAME DEPARTMENT

I'm glad you could spare the time to talk with me. The purpose of our meeting is to provide the United States Army with good, current information about the job of a Second Lieutenant. We will use the information to help refine the selection and training procedures for individuals coming into that position. All aspects of our new program will be built around the job data we get from these interviews -- so you can see that your participation is very important.

This is a somewhat different kind of interview.

We will be looking primarily for actual examples of behavior on the job -- what specialists call "critical incidents." Here is a handout that explains what we are looking for. (Pass out handout -- give time to read.)

When giving an incident you may use the person's name or not -- it doesn't make any difference. No names of individuals will appear in the final report.

I would appreciate it if everyone would participate, as all of you know the job and its demands.

Feel free to build on the ideas of others. Frequently one previous experience will remind you of another incident.

We won't be evaluating ideas -- we just want a lot of clear examples of how Second Lieutenants do their jobs.

I'll take notes on this form so that I don't lose any of the important points. Your answers will be combined with the answers of all of the other people whom we interview, so the answers you give will not be identified as yours in any report we make. You may speak in complete confidence.

Do you have any questions?

Ok -- Can you ...

1. Think of an incident indicating outstanding (extremely effective) performance in a Second Lieutenant's position. Describe the situation, the behavior, and the consequence.

(If no response): It may help to think of a person who is outstanding, then think of incidents you've seen.

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Additional examples

_____

_____

_____

Further examples

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

The person doesn't have to be consistently good. Have you seen situations where an unusually poor performer did something well?

What was unusual about what he/she did?

Can you think of another example?

(Call on quiet ones)

2. Think of an incident that indicated less than effective (poor) performance as a Second Lieutenant. Describe specifically the siutation, the behavior, and the consequence.

Examples

Additional examples

Further Examples

You've possibly seen situations where a top performer did something which wasn't effective.

Can you describe that?

More examples?

Others?

There must be more.

(Call on others to see if examples unique)

"___, have you ever had a situation like that?"

Is this a typical problem?

Can you describe another example?

3. What technical knowledge or skills are necessary for success in this position? Examples of incidents illustrating where technical knowledge or skills have been important?

Incidents?

More Incidents?

4. What do you see as the three major functions or responsibilities of a Second Lieutenant?

(Go around the room) _____

_____

_____

(After the first three or four, "Do you agree?) _____

_____

_____

(Get discussion going.) _____

_____

_____

Can you think of examples of positive performance for each of those? _____

_____

_____

_____

Examples of poor performance for each? _____

_____

_____

Other examples? _____

_____

_____

5. What are the common problems you, as a supervisor of Second Lieutenants have with officers at this level when they are newly commissioned?

_____

_____

Can you give examples that illustrate each of those? _____

_____

_____

More examples? _____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Other cases? _____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

"____, do you have the same problems?" _____

_____

_____

_____

6. What criteria do you use to evaluate Second Lieutenants who report to you?

Incidents

More Incidents

CLOSING COMMENTS

THANK YOU FOR YOUR HELP. YOUR FRANKNESS AND OPENNESS PROVIDED ME WITH VALUABLE INFORMATION.

THE NEXT STEP IN THE PROCESS IS THAT I AND THE OTHER MEMBERS OF THE ANALYST TEAM REVIEW THE INFORMATION GATHERED TODAY AND IN THE OTHER MEETINGS AND INTERVIEWS AND DISTILL IT INTO UNDERLYING DIMENSIONS (CRITERIA, SKILLS, ABILITIES, CHARACTERISTICS).

WE WILL THEN DISTRIBUTE A QUESTIONNARIE CONTAINING A PRELIMINARY LIST OF DIMENSIONS. OTHER CAPTAINS AND MAJORS WILL THEN EVALUATE THOSE DIMENSIONS AS TO THEIR IMPORTANCE SO WE CAN BE SURE THAT OUR SELECTION SYSTEM WILL FOCUS ON THE KEY REQUIREMENTS.

HANDOUT GIVEN TO PARTICIPANT IN
CRITICAL INCIDENT DISCUSSION

Three parts of a "critical incident"

A critical incident has three parts:

1. The situation, circumstances, or setting of the "story."

2. The behavior, or activity performed.

3. The consequence, or result of the behavior.

"A Start" I have a Second Lieutenant in my company that really does a good job of anticipating problems.

"Better" I have a Second Lieutenant in my company that really does a good job of conducting marksmanship training on the firing line.

"Ideal" I have a Second Lieutenant who is first into the company each morning. He checks with his NCOs to ensure the right troops are scheduled for training, details or extra duty. Then, he proceeds to the training area with his troops and makes sure everything they need for that particular training session is at hand. He then checks with me to see if there are any last minute changes. When the training period starts, his troops are ready and get right to work without wasting any time.

APPENDIX C. DIMENSION SELECTION QUESTIONNAIRE

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

SECOND LIEUTENANT

DIMENSION SELECTION QUESTIONNAIRE

The following pages list 13 behavioral dimensions which have tentatively been identified as related to successful job performance of second lieutenants in the United States Army.

In order to design the selection system planned for second lieutenant candidates in such a way as to maximize both the validity and utility of the program, we need your assistance in evaluating the importance of these dimensions. Please follow the steps outlined below.

RATING OF IMPORTANCE

I. Read all of these instructions before making evaluations.

II. Read all dimensions, definitions, and descriptions carefully. Do not make any evaluations until this is done.

III. Rate the dimensions according to your opinion as to their importance for success as a second lieutenant by placing one of the following numbers in the column to the right of the dimension and its definition.

4 - Absolutely essential. A person could not possibly perform satisfactorily in the job without a high degree of skill in this area.

3 - Essential. It would be very difficult for a person to perform satisfactorily in the job without considerable skill in this area.

2 - Useful. but not essential. Skill in this area would sometimes enhance job performance, but satisfactory performance could be expected without it.

1 - Unnecessary. Skill in this area would almost never have anything to do with satisfactory job performance.

IV. Rate each dimension independently. Make your ratings on your understanding of JOB REQUIREMENTS ONLY. In certain individuals, strengths in some dimensions can compensate for weakness in other dimensions. The focus of this study must be on the requirements of the job -- not on individuals who are performing or who have performed in them.

V. Try to ignore any overlap which might exist between dimensions. Think of each dimension independently. When rating a dimension, force yourself to forget the other 12 dimensions.

VI. Tear off this page so that you have ready access to the rating scale (Section III above) as you rate the dimensions.

VII. Begin rating now.

PRECEDING PAGE BLANK-NOT FILMED

COMMUNICATION SKILLS

Importance

Oral Communication Skill: Effective expression in individual or group situations (includes gestures and nonverbal communication). _____

(Second lieutenants must communicate with their NCOs and other members of their platoons in giving directions, answering questions and providing task performance feedback. They conduct meetings with their NCOs and participate in meetings run by the unit commander and others. They keep the unit commander up-to-date on platoon activities and other unit problems that arise. They work with other officers and NCOs to meet the needs of their unit. The skill of effectively communicating during these interactions is crucial to ensure complete understanding.)

(The focus of this dimension is on the clarity and form of the communication, not the content. Typical communication areas of concern are as follows: clarity, tone, volume, snytax, grammar, eye contact, rate, inflection/modulation, emotion, organization, persuasiveness, enthusiasm, confidence, brevity and nonverbal communication such as gestures, facial expressions, etc.)

Written Communication Skill: Clear expression of ideas in writing and in good grammatical form. _____

(Second lieutenants are frequently required to express themselves in writing in a variety of circumstances. They are required to submit reports on the status of training in their platoons, prepare replies to inspection reports, submit promotion recommendations and write on other similar matters. They also prepare in writing: performance evaluations on the NCOs in their platoons, memos, letters to unit commanders and, sometimes, to other senior officers. As a result, the ability to convey ideas clearly in writing is a necessary skill for second lieutenants.)

Importance

Oral Presentation Skill: Effective expression when presenting ideas or tasks to an individual or to a group when given time for preparation (includes gestures and nonverbal communication). _____

(The important distinction between oral communication skill and oral presentation skill is the phrase "given time for preparation." For the second lieutenant, oral presentation situations include making presentations to senior officers and/or presentations to subordinates on a variety of subjects, usually on the status of unit effectiveness. These presentations are usually one-on-one or to small groups. The presentations can be made standing up with visual aids or at the desk. Also, they can be made either under garrison or field circumstances. Oral presentation also includes the ability to field questions following a presentation.)

(Other important elements of oral presentation skill are: pitching the presentation at the appropriate level for the audience; reacting appropriately to audience reactions and concerns; gaining commitment and acceptance, when appropriate. The second lieutenant must project a knowledgeable, professional image. Similar areas of concern as listed under oral communication skill are considered. In addition, the opening and closing of the presentation as well as the rapport established are crucial, and use of visual aids are evaluated.)

PERSONAL/MOTIVATIONAL SKILLS

Importance

Initiative: Active attempts to influence events to achieve goals; self-starting rather than passive acceptance. Taking action to achieve goals beyond those called for; originating action. _____

(Second lieutenants frequently work without close supervision from a superior officer, particularly in field situations. Inherent in this situation is the job of leading a military unit and the need to originate and sometimes take actions that go beyond specific job responsibilities. Second lieutenants need to be initiators and originators instead of just reacting to events. A second lieutenant should take action as soon as a problem begins developing and not wait until someone else suggests that the situation needs attention. This is particularly true in the field where major initiations are frequently needed in order to accomplish unit objectives. The innovative lieutenant goes beyond word-to-word content of directions and takes action to improve unit efficiency.)

INTERPERSONAL SKILLS

Sensitivity: Actions that indicate a consideration for the feelings and needs of others. _____

(The second lieutenant needs to possess the skill to take actions based on an accurate appraisal of the feelings, competencies, and needs of others, particularly the NCOs and personnel of his/her unit. An accurate perception of how others see him/her is also important. A second lieutenant must take subordinates' feelings into consideration during one-on-one meetings especially when disciplining or examining problem performance. He/she must be able to smooth over relations among subordinates as well as between subordinates and officers/NCOs from other units. He/she must also freely acknowledge special help from subordinates/superiors and other individuals and take actions which consider subordinates' feelings when resolving complaints.)

(This dimension is not to be confused with Sympathy, which is how an individual feels about a person or situation. It is nearer the definition of Empathy, but involves taking action on the insights, not just having insights.)

Importance

Interpersonal Leadership: Utilization of appropriate interpersonal styles and methods in guiding individuals (subordinates, peers, superiors) or groups toward task accomplishment. _____

(Most second lieutenant positions require individuals who can lead others toward accomplishing unit goals. Generally, it is expected that these individuals must be able to adopt a leadership style commensurate with the situation. The focus is not only on the effect of the attempts to get people to change, but also on the means employed to achieve these changes. Despite lack of experience, the second lieutenant must be able to motivate, guide, or inspire the members of his/her unit toward accomplishing assigned objectives. Likewise, in interactions with peers and/or superiors, the second lieutenant needs to be persuasive in getting his/her ideas adopted. He/she must set an example for all subordinates and must be able to coach, train and counsel subordinates in job responsibilities.

ADMINISTRATIVE SKILLS

Planning and Organizing: Establishing a course of action for self and/or others to accomplish a specific goal; planning proper assignments of personnel and appropriate allocation of resources. _____

(The position of second lieutenant requires individuals who can plan and organize for themselves and others. Most second lieutenants prepare task assignments for members of their units according to importance and urgency. They must assign tasks to NCOs or other members of their units, as appropriate, and reschedule priorities and assignments due to unforeseen problems. They must take actions to meet suspense for reports or other needs of the organization. They must manage their own time to make effective use of time available and allocate resources necessary for the accomplishment of assigned unit tasks.)

Importance

Delegation: Utilizing subordinates effectively. Allocating decision making and other responsibilities to the appropriate subordinates. _____

(Most second lieutenant positions require individuals who can effectively allocate work to their subordinates. There are many facets to the delegation dimension. It includes what is delegated (responsibility, authority, or information gathering); how it is delegated (clarity and specificity of the delegation); and the target of the delegation (is it the most appropriate person). All of these factors are important and must be considered in evaluating the effectiveness of the delegations of an individual. Second lieutenants must frequently prepare precise instructions and assignments of specific tasks to subordinates.)

Management Control: Establishing procedures to monitor and/or regulate processes, tasks or activities of subordinates and job activities and responsibilities. Taking action to monitor the results of delegated assignments or projects. _____

(Second lieutenants must see the need for and take action to establish controls over procedures or methods for the accomplishment of unit work tasks and activities. The most frequent monitoring device employed by second lieutenants is direct observation. However, provisions for feedback such as weekly reports or daily meetings with NCOs are also of significant value or usefulness. Second lieutenants must follow up on directions given to subordinates to ensure that they are followed correctly. They must monitor the progress, activities and achievements of their units as compared to the timetables of assigned objectives. They must check to make sure that delegated assignments are completed within the time frame established.)

DECISION MAKING SKILLS

Importance

Problem Analysis: Identifying problems, securing relevant information, relating data from different sources and identifying possible causes of problems. _____

(Second lieutenants are faced with a myriad of problems at unit level which they must have the skill to solve. They must be able to correctly identify existing surface as well as underlying problems. Secondly, they must possess the skill and knowledge to recognize and collect pertinent information critical to the problem. Third, they must possess the skill to accurately analyze the information relative to the problem. Finally, they must be able to correctly identify the cause of the problem and possibly potential problems that could occur if the immediate problem is not solved. Examples of such problems are decreasing unit morale, failure to achieve unit training goals, increasing crime rate within the unit, etc.)

Judgment: Developing alternative courses of action and making decisions which are based on logical assumptions and which reflect factual information. _____

(Second lieutenants are required to make decisions on a daily basis in many different areas of activity. Judgment reflects the degree to which people use the information they are given or have obtained, develop alternative possiblities, perceive the appropriateness of the actions open to them, understand the pros and cons of each alternative, and choose the most appropriate alternative. For example, second lieutenants must know when to discipline, who to discipline, when to believe their NCOs, etc.)

Decisiveness: Readiness to make decisions, render judgments, take action, or commit oneself. _____

(Second lieutenants are required to make many decisions during the course of fullfiling their job responsibilities. They need to be able to determine how many facts are necessary in a given situation in order to make a decision. The position requires individuals who will make a decision, given sufficient information, and not needlessly seek or wait for further information.)

TECHNICAL SKILLS

Importance

Technical Competency: Level of understanding and ability to use technical/professional information. _____

Second lieutenants must display effective technical and tactical competence by appropriately utilizing map reading skills. They must maintain knowledge of Army regulations, equipment and weapon maintenance and use. They must apply job knowledge appropriately to tactical and/or technical decisions.

APPENDIX D. ASSESSEE FINAL REPORT FORMAT

LEADERSHIP ASSESSMENT PROGRAM

FINAL REPORT

I. Participant Information

A. Name of Participant: _____
(last) (first) (initial)

B. Social Security Number: _____

C. Program/College Attending: _____

D. Assessment Group Color: _____ Participant Number: _____

II. Overall Evaluation

You are asked to provide two general ratings below. On item A, you should rate the participant on how well you think his/her performance in the Leadership Assessment Program would compare to that of a recently commissioned second lieutenant. On item B, you should make a judgment on the participant's potential to become an effective junior officer once he/she has completed precommissioning and officer basic course training.

A. Leadership Assessment Program Performance Rating

( ) Performed above the level of most new second lieutenants.
( ) Performed at the level of most new second lieutenants.
( ) Performed acceptably, but not quite at the level of new second lieutenants.
( ) Performed considerably below the level of new second lieutenants.

B. Officer Potential Rating

( ) Outstanding
( ) Above Average
( ) Average
( ) Below Average
( ) Poor

III. Dimension Ratings

Written Communication Skill	____	Delegation	____
Initiative	____	Administrative Control	____
Social Awareness	____	Problem Analysis	____
Planning and Organizing	____	Judgment	____
Decisiveness	____	Oral Communication Skill	____
Oral Presentattion Skill	____	Leadership	____

IV. Summary of Demonstrated Major Strengths (Document with behaviors.)

V. Summary of Demonstrated Major Weaknesses (Document with behaviors.)

VI. Recommended Developmental Actions

Report Prepared by:_____ Date:____/____/____

Assessors: 1)_____ 2)_____ 3)_____
(print name) (print name) (print name)

_____ _____ _____
(signature) (signature) (signature)

APPENDIX E. ASSESSEE REACTIONS FIRST FIELD TEST

ROTC Student Reactions
1st Field Test

Response	%	# of Students
Attitudes Toward Program Prior to Participation		
- Greatly Looked Forward to Going	16.7	(3)
- Looked Forward to Going	50.0	(9)
- Did Not Care	16.7	(3)
- Somewhat Reluctant	16.7	(3)
- Very Reluctant to Go	--	
Reactions to Program After Participation		
- Very Good	55.0	(10)
- Good	45.0	(8)
- Poor	--	
- Very Poor	--	
Effectiveness of Assessment Staff		
- Good Job	100.0	(18)
- Moderate Job	--	
- Poor Job	--	

ROTC Student Ratings of Exercise Interest

	Very Good	Good	Average	Poor	Very Poor
- In-Basket	38.9 (7)	33.3 (6)	27.7 (5)	--	--
- Scheduling Exercise	22.2 (4)	44.4 (8)	33.3 (6)	--	--
- Oral Presentation	22.2 (4)	22.2 (4)	44.4 (8)	11.1 (2)	--
- Counseling Simulation	44.4 (8)	33.3 (6)	16.6 (3)	5.5 (1)	
- Group Discussion	55.5 (10)	27.7 (5)	16.6 (3)	--	--

APPENDIX F. ASSESSOR REACTIONS FIRST FIELD TEST

ROTC Instructor Reactions
1st Field Test

Response	%	# of Instructors
Attitudes Toward Program Prior to Participation		
- Greatly Looked Forward to Going	12.5	(1)
- Looked Forward to Going	50.0	(4)
- Did Not Care	12.5	(1)
- Somewhat Reluctant to Go	25.0	(2)
- Very Reluctant to Go	--	
Value of Program After Participation		
- Extremely Valuable	87.5	(7)
- Valuable	12.5	(1)
- Not Particularly Valuable	--	
- Waste of Time	--	
Assessor Training Program Effectiveness		
- Very Effective	50.0	(4)
- Effective	37.5	(3)
- Satisfactory	12.5	(1)
- Ineffective	--	
- Very Ineffective	--	
Length of Assessor Training		
- Too Long	--	
- Just About Right	62.5	(5)
- Too Short	36.5	(3)
Leadership Dimensions Portrayal of Junior Officer Job		
- Very Accurate	75.0	(5)
- Accurate	25.0	(3)
- Somewhat Inaccurate	--	
- Very Inaccurate	--	
Confidence in Judgments of Cadets		
- Extremely Confident	37.5	(3)
- Confident	62.5	(5)
- Only Somewhat Confident	--	
- Not at all Confident	--	

PRECEDING PAGE BLANK-NOT FILMED

ROTC instructor Reactions
1st Field Test (Continued)

	Very Good	Good	Average	Poor	Very Poor
Value of Assessor Training					
- Evaluating Performance of Cadets/Officer Candidates	100.0 (8)	--	--	--	--
- Evaluating Performance of Subordinates in Future Assignments	62.5 (5)	37.5 (3)	--	--	--
- Counseling Subordinates/Students on Job/School Related Matters	100.0 (8)	--	--	--	--
Value of Assessment Program for ROTC Instructors					
- Surfacing the Cadet's Developmental Needs	100.0 (8)	--	--	--	--
- Selecting Cadets into ROTC Program	12.5 (1)	62.5 (5)	25.0 (2)	--	--
- Giving Cadets Realistic Views of Junior Officer Job	62.5 (5)	25.0 (2)	12.5 (1)	--	--
- Serving as Leadership Training	75.0 (6)	12.5 (1)	12.5 (1)	--	--

APPENDIX G. OCS ASSESSEE REACTIONS SECOND FIELD TEST

OCS Candidate Reactions
2nd Field Test

Response	%	# of Students
Overall Reaction to Leadership Assessment Program		
- Very Good	60.0	(6)
- Good	40.0	(4)
- Poor	--	
- Very Poor	--	
Recommend Program to Fellow Candidate		
- Highly Recommend	85.7	(6)
- Recommend	14.3	(1)
- Recommend with Reservations	--	
- Not Recommend	--	
Evaluation of Performance in Program		
- Very Accurate	71.5	(5)
- Reasonably Accurate	28.5	(2)
- Inaccurate in Many Respects	--	
- Totally Inaccurate	--	

APPENDIX H. OCS ASSESSOR REACTIONS SECOND FIELD TEST

OCS Instructor Reactions
2nd Field Test

Response	%	# of Instructors
Value of Leadership Assessment Program		
- Extemely Valuable	100.0	(5)
- Valuable	--	
- Not Particularly Valuable	--	
- Complete Waste of Time	--	
Value of Student Feedback Session		
- Very Valuable	100.0	(5)
- Valuable	--	
- Not Very Valuable	--	
- Not at all Valuable	--	
Effectiveness of Assessor Training Program		
- Very Effective	60.0	(3)
- Effective	40.0	(2)
- Satisfactory	--	
- Ineffective	--	
- Very Effective	--	

PRECEDING PAGE BLANK-NOT FILMED

070783