

USAWC STRATEGY RESEARCH PROJECT

NAVAL LEADERSHIP ASSESSMENT  
AND DEVELOPMENT

by

Commander Richard H. Rosene  
United States Naval Reserve

Doctor Craig Bullis  
Project Advisor

This SRP is submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements of the Master of Strategic Studies Degree. The U.S. Army War College is accredited by the Commission on Higher Education of the Middle States Association of Colleges and Schools, 3624 Market Street, Philadelphia, PA 19104, (215) 662-5606. The Commission on Higher Education is an institutional accrediting agency recognized by the U.S. Secretary of Education and the Council for Higher Education Accreditation.

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

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

# Report Documentation Page

Form Approved  
OMB No. 0704-0188

Public reporting burden for the collection of information is estimated to average 1 hour per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to Washington Headquarters Services, Directorate for Information Operations and Reports, 1215 Jefferson Davis Highway, Suite 1204, Arlington VA 22202-4302. Respondents should be aware that notwithstanding any other provision of law, no person shall be subject to a penalty for failing to comply with a collection of information if it does not display a currently valid OMB control number.

|   |                                    |                                     |                            |  |                                 |
|---|------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|----------------------------|--|---------------------------------|
| 1. REPORT DATE<br><b>18 MAR 2005</b>  |                                    | 2. REPORT TYPE                      |                            | 3. DATES COVERED<br>-                    |                                 |
| 4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE<br><b>Naval Leadership Assessment and Development</b>   |                                    |                                     |                            | 5a. CONTRACT NUMBER                      |                                 |
|   |                                    |                                     |                            | 5b. GRANT NUMBER                         |                                 |
|   |                                    |                                     |                            | 5c. PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER               |                                 |
| 6. AUTHOR(S)<br><b>Richard Rosene</b>   |                                    |                                     |                            | 5d. PROJECT NUMBER                       |                                 |
|   |                                    |                                     |                            | 5e. TASK NUMBER                          |                                 |
|   |                                    |                                     |                            | 5f. WORK UNIT NUMBER                     |                                 |
| 7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES)<br><b>U.S. Army War College, Carlisle Barracks, Carlisle, PA, 17013-5050</b> |                                    |                                     |                            | 8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER |                                 |
| 9. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES)   |                                    |                                     |                            | 10. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S ACRONYM(S)         |                                 |
|   |                                    |                                     |                            | 11. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S REPORT NUMBER(S)   |                                 |
| 12. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY STATEMENT<br><b>Approved for public release; distribution unlimited</b>                           |                                    |                                     |                            |  |                                 |
| 13. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES   |                                    |                                     |                            |  |                                 |
| 14. ABSTRACT<br><b>See attached.</b>  |                                    |                                     |                            |  |                                 |
| 15. SUBJECT TERMS   |                                    |                                     |                            |  |                                 |
| 16. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF:   |                                    |                                     | 17. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT | 18. NUMBER OF PAGES<br><b>22</b>         | 19a. NAME OF RESPONSIBLE PERSON |
| a. REPORT<br><b>unclassified</b>  | b. ABSTRACT<br><b>unclassified</b> | c. THIS PAGE<br><b>unclassified</b> |                            |  |                                 |



## ABSTRACT

AUTHOR: Commander Richard H. Rosene  
TITLE: Naval Leadership Assessment and Development  
FORMAT: Strategy Research Project  
DATE: 18 March 2005 PAGES: 22 CLASSIFICATION: Unclassified

The current Chief of Naval Operations has embarked on a bold program of investing in the tools, a culture, and training to prepare service members for the future. The Navy has been given credit in some circles for embracing transformation, and having a culture which is less resistant to change than her sister services. However, it must get ahead of the bow-wave before it can claim to have a culture which embraces change, is truly adaptive, flexible, and responsive. Notably, the Navy lacks formalized doctrine concerning the development of Human Resources.

Presently the Navy maintains a traditional feedback system provided primarily by a single supervisor. A well designed multi-source assessment system collects the collective knowledge of those who work most closely with a service member, providing specific information on skills, behaviors and critical competencies. A 360 degree assessment should be adopted to ensure benefits are transmitted to all the important stakeholders. These stakeholders include all its various customers, other service members, specific team members and coworkers, direct supervisors, leaders and managers, and the service-member themselves.

The Navy should implement programs to increase Leadership Capacity in junior and mid-grade officers by teaching the new concepts of Emotional Intelligence and 'Edge.' As leading is not solely a series of mechanical tasks, but a set of human interactions, the development of emotional intelligence will have a profound benefit to the Navy.



## TABLE OF CONTENTS

|  |     |
|--|-----|
| ABSTRACT.....                                    | iii |
| NAVAL LEADERSHIP ASSESSMENT AND DEVELOPMENT..... | 1   |
| <b>WHO HAS THE CONN?</b> .....                   | 1   |
| <b>SETTING A TRUE HEADING</b> .....              | 1   |
| <b>WHAT'S AT STAKE?</b> .....                    | 2   |
| <b>ON COURSE?</b> .....                          | 3   |
| <b>THE OFFICER FITNESS REPORT</b> .....          | 4   |
| <b>EVERYONE IS A LEADER</b> .....                | 5   |
| <b>THE 360 DEGREE ASSESSMENT</b> .....           | 8   |
| <b>CONCLUSION</b> .....                          | 11  |
| ENDNOTES .....                                   | 13  |
| BIBLIOGRAPHY .....                               | 15  |



## NAVAL LEADERSHIP ASSESSMENT AND DEVELOPMENT

### **Steering the Course - On Leadership**

We will create an environment that attracts, retains and relies upon bold, creative, effective and competitive people. We will foster a culture that cherishes these attributes and rewards them accordingly. We will invest in the tools, the information technology and the training that delivers more meaningful job content to them because it is they who offer us our greatest advantage. It is they who will continue to generate our legacy for years to come.

- ADM Vern Clark, Chief of Naval Operations

### **WHO HAS THE CONN?**

In any organization, including the Navy, the senior line officer has the responsibility for health and welfare of all. Specifically with regard to the question, "Who has the CONN?" of a ship", members of the naval service and students of naval lore know that the officer's name who is entered into the ships log as "having the CONN", has assumed responsibility of the ship. In regard to the administration of the U.S. Navy personnel, the Chief of Naval Operations (CNO) "has the CONN."<sup>1</sup> The current Chief of Naval Operations quoted above has embarked on a course which will do more to transform the culture, training, and success of the Navy, than anything done in decades. Is he willing to include potentially the most radical change in decades: how the Navy evaluates its personnel? A strategy has been developed and used with increasing frequency in business to create a culture which may enable the necessary individual and organizational development. The 360 degree feedback model, or multi-rater assessment, may be used as part of an ongoing process of assessment, performance evaluation, and discussion of performance with supervisors, subordinates, peers, and others. This process should include setting goals, creating development experiences, improving performance, and enhancing organizational development.<sup>2</sup>

### **SETTING A TRUE HEADING**

The Navy must dedicate itself to new ways of learning. "Long distance learning, for instance, may well make obsolete within twenty-five years that uniquely American institution, the freestanding undergraduate college. It is becoming clearer every day that these technical changes will-indeed must-lead to redefining what is meant by education. One probable consequence: The center of gravity in higher education (i.e., postsecondary teaching and learning) may shift to the continuing professional education of adults during their entire working lives."<sup>3</sup>

When it comes to defending our shores and fighting our nation's wars, historically the profession of arms generally, and the Navy specifically, has focused more on manual work, than information work. If we compare ourselves to the business model, we find that while “. . . the most valuable assets of the 20<sup>th</sup> century company were its production equipment. The most valuable asset of a 21<sup>st</sup> century institution, whether business or non-business, will be its knowledge workers and their productivity.”<sup>4</sup> As the art of war becomes more technical and technology based, the Navy's service members will need to adapt and become more information management savvy.

### **WHAT'S AT STAKE?**

The ability of the United States Navy to effectively perform its mission may be at stake if it does not take major steps toward assessing officer performance, leadership development, promote interpersonal skill development, and adopt developmental alternatives. Peter F. Drucker, the renowned Harvard University business and management expert posited in his recent book, *Management Challenges for the 21<sup>st</sup> Century*, “*Every organization operates on a Theory of the Business,*” that is, a set of assumptions as to what its business is, what its objectives are, how it defines results, who its customers are, what the customers value and pay for.”<sup>5</sup> The purpose of this paper is not to go into how the Theory of Business relates to the Naval mission, but it is useful to address some of the assumptions or “certainties” that he and others feel must be addressed in the future to ensure success of the military strategy. The five certainties which are not essentially economic are: 1. The Collapsing Birth Rate in the Developed World, 2. Shifts in the Distribution of Disposable Income, 3. Defining Performance, 4. Global Competitiveness, and 5. The Growing Incongruence Between Economic Globalization and Political Splintering.<sup>6</sup> From this list, two certainties should concern us: number 1. The collapsing birth rate in the developed world, and 3. Defining Performance. It has been shown empirically, in both Drucker's and Huntington's work, that indeed the birth rate is collapsing in the developed world.<sup>7</sup> The reason this should concern us is that the military service is competing, along with all other enterprises, for human resources. It is crucial that each military service in the coming decades recruit and retain a sufficient number of quality candidates to ‘fill the ranks.’ Under “Defining performance” Drucker initially addresses performance in the typical way businesses have addressed it since they were first formed: as a benefit to the owner or shareholders. But now the debate over business performance is beginning to use terms like “stakeholders” and members (formerly workers), realize the necessity of being connected to and

generate “commitment” to an organization. Getting “buy-in” from all constituents, especially those who do the work, is increasingly important.

The Navy has recently announced significant cuts in end-strength for the ‘out’ years. These cuts may push the service’s end-strength to below 320,000 by 2011, a loss of over 50,000 Sailors. The Navy plans to institute such radical policies as lowering High-Year tenure for E-5s; making it tougher for sailors to re-enlist; asking Congress for new separation pay programs and benefits; and hold retirement boards for chiefs and officers, if necessary. “This will be about competition to stay in the Navy,” says the Head of Military Personnel Plans and Policy. “We want to keep the top performers. That is essential to our future.”<sup>8</sup> Such dramatic force-shaping tools have not been considered for decades, and place a distinct and urgent challenge before Naval leadership to ensure the best personnel are retained.

### **ON COURSE?**

The Navy, like any institution, has embedded within it significant difficulties in overcoming the past, properly measuring performance, and developing the leaders of the future. To be sure, the Navy has been faithful to the core values “Honor, Courage, and Commitment.” But it is necessary to go beyond slogans and address some of the mechanics which have ‘stove in’ our ship. Unlike her sister services, the Navy lacks formalized doctrine concerning virtually any subject with the exception of Naval operations and tactics. While the Navy has had many visionary leaders who provided the new heading when coming aboard, at mid-course, or as needed, it has not had a plethora of leaders who were willing to dismiss the old ‘one dimensional’ ranking systems which failed to take advantage of significant changes in performance assessment systems. The advancement of officers and enlisted personnel has been made without the use of recently developed multi-dimensional rating systems.

The differences between leadership and management have been highlighted and studied vigorously over the last two decades and much has been learned. Significantly, it can be stated that much, if not most of the Navy still believes that management is the same as leadership, but ironically, they will tell you in practically the same breath that one can be learned, while the other, you either have it or you don’t. There is an old ‘saw’ which seems appropriate here: “A group of tourists, being driven by bus, were stopping in a small town for a brief lunch stop. While waiting to be seated, they noticed an older gentleman rocking on a porch nearby. One of the tourists asked if any famous people (leaders) had been born in the town. The man thought for a few seconds and replied, ‘No, only babies.’” The gentleman’s witty repose highlights the

fact that whether or not we are born with the qualities of a great leader, we all begin as infants, and all have the capacity to develop.

The Navy's culture is similar to other organizations in that there is a very distinct set of values, beliefs, social structure, and history which its members share. These common experiences help to guide its future decisions and determine significant actions. The reader should note that because of some of the very harsh and dangerous conditions in which the Navy successfully operates, its leaders are often quick to embrace new ideas when confronted by a rapidly changing environment. Success in this arena certainly makes Navy leaders more confident in their wisdom. However, the same cannot be said concerning its way of identifying and developing its future leaders.

### **THE OFFICER FITNESS REPORT**

Given that more than 60% of the Navy's budget is spent recruiting, training, and retaining the force, and that reduced manning will provide fewer personnel to develop into leaders, it would seem that giving honest, direct and unemotional evaluations would immediately benefit the command and the individuals.<sup>9</sup> According to Bossidy, who served with Jack Welch while at GE, "a good, candid assessment talks about the things a candidate does well and the things he or she must do better. It's that simple. I don't use words that don't say anything. It's very straightforward. It's specific. It's to the point."<sup>10</sup> Presently, the Fitness Report and Evaluation systems are anything but that. While forced choice selections are 'rank' ordered for various traits, the 'write-up' section is completely free-form. The Supervisor is in complete control concerning the level of detail to include or omit. While the form has been overhauled in recent years, the requirement to be more specific has not been realized. The last major change to the system was imposed in 1990 by then Chief of Naval Personnel, and now deceased ADM Michael Boorda.<sup>11</sup> The current product is single dimensional in that it uses the inputs of the direct supervisor only, and fails to take advantage of a greater source of inputs. A frequent comment made describing the Navy evaluation system is that it is akin to 'holding up a mirror.' If it is, without 360 degree feedback, it may not be a mirror which is very 'highly polished.' Through a multi-rater process, a member is confronted with better information showing a gap between 'walking the talk' and 'walking the walk.'<sup>12</sup>

Recent books and articles have made the crucial point that people aren't your most important asset – the "right" people - are your most important asset. That's not the only thing we are learning. We've discovered that getting the right person into the right position is crucial. The metaphor in vogue is "getting the right people on the bus, the wrong people off, and the

people in the right seats.<sup>13</sup> The use of a multi-rater assessment system will facilitate this concept.

### **EVERYONE IS A LEADER**

There are many popular definitions of 'Leadership.' Kouzes and Posner define leadership as "the art of mobilizing others to want to struggle for shared aspirations."<sup>14</sup> It is more art than science, there is a 'want to' by the follower, and there is an objective. Most definitions resonate with the elements embodied above. An important attribute of a successful organization is the commitment and dedication to creating leadership capacity, otherwise known as leaders at every level of the organization.<sup>15</sup> If Leadership is defined as "influencing – nothing more and nothing less," then anyone can be a leader to someone else. Because the Navy expects members to 'fill-in-the-ranks' and apply leadership in oftentimes very dynamic situations, it needs to cultivate more leaders. These previously untested and future leaders need to be prepared by their current leader. The ultimate test for a leader is not whether he or she makes smart decisions, but whether he or she teaches others to be leaders and builds an organization that can sustain its success even when he or she is not around.<sup>16</sup>

The notion of 'leadership capacity' is extremely important. It is not simply a function of the number or quality of individuals in formal leadership roles, rather, it implies a system of leadership, if you will, and that can extract leadership wisdom, insight, and behaviors from many more individuals. Thus it fuels the continuing search for different kinds of leadership approaches, both individual and joint, at all levels of the organization. In fact, many downsizing, restructuring, and reengineering efforts are actually reducing the number of leadership and management positions in the formal structure. The objective function of all this is to expand the capacity for leadership and independent initiative without having to increase the number of individuals in formal leadership roles.<sup>17</sup>

To further this concept, it is important to point out that each leader has a 'teachable point of view,' which in essence is the knowledge to be imparted upon his or her constituents. This teachable point of view consists of three major components: 1. Ideas- Leaders have clear ideas of what it takes to be successful in their marketplace and how the organization should operate; 2. Values- Leaders and their organizations have strong values that everyone understands and lives up to; and 3. E<sup>3</sup>: Emotional Energy and 'Edge'- Leaders are not only highly energetic people themselves, but they also actively work to create positive emotional energy in others. "Edge" is a term used by former GE CEO Jack Welch to describe certain leadership qualities. Edge is best defined as 'the ability to make tough decisions and the willingness to sacrifice the security of today for the sake of a better future.'<sup>18</sup> This certainly describes an unmet need in today's transformational Navy.

A study of Harvard graduates in the fields of law, medicine, teaching, and business found that scores on entrance exams – a surrogate for IQ – had zero or negative correlation with their eventual career success. Emotional aptitudes make the critical difference.

- Daniel Goldman

#### Emotional Intelligence and Working with Emotional Intelligence

Recent studies have focused on an Emotional Intelligence (EI) in addition to the other types of intelligence.<sup>19</sup> Thomas Teal, in his work suggests that there are very few managers that we consider really “great.” Teal suggests that most managers are described so “in spite of the fact that they lack a dozen of the skills and virtues that we normally insist on (and that the job description probably requires).”<sup>20</sup> The author believes that one of the reasons that good managers are infrequently found or acknowledged is due simply to the fact that their education and upbringing were focused too much on skill proficiency and not enough on how to act or behave as managers. The specific point is that “the only people who become great managers (and we would say leaders as well) are ones who understand in their guts that managing is not merely a series of mechanical tasks but a set of human interactions.”<sup>21</sup> In comparing a skill proficiency to a ‘gut’ understanding of working and dealing with people, the author suggests there is a difference between IQ (Intellectual Quotient) and that being identified as emotional intelligence in determining a person’s eventual measure of success.

Work concerning the concept of emotional intelligence and the effect it has on an individual’s success, and why researchers believe EI is more significant in his or her success than just a high IQ, is on the rise. As a definition, emotional intelligence is our capability to (1) manage our emotions, and (2) recognize others emotions. Howard Gardner, a Harvard psychologist, is considered one of the most influential theorists of intelligence and was one of the first to point out the distinction between intellectual and emotional capacities, proposed in 1983 a highly regarded model of “multiple intelligence.”<sup>22</sup> The most widely regarded author concerning this subject is Daniel Goleman. The author of at least three influential books on the subject, Goleman and others believe that while IQ is basically unchangeable EQ, with substantial effort focused on developing new habits, can be. Emotional intelligence is especially relevant for those in leadership roles. Goleman states: “My analysis of myriad jobs found that emotional competence makes up about two thirds of the ingredients of star performance in general, but for outstanding leaders, emotional competence – as opposed to technical or cognitive cues. – makes up 80 to 100 percent of those (ingredients) crucial for success.”<sup>23</sup> A whole chorus of believers support this fairly radical idea. Matthew Juechter, the chairman of the American Society for Training and Development states: “Leadership is almost all emotional

intelligence, especially in distinguishing what managers do and leaders do – things like taking a stand, know what’s important to you, pursuing goals in partnership with others.”<sup>24</sup> The claim here of course is not to indicate that cognitive skills are not important. The data is replete with examples of senior managers and successful CEOs who, in addition to emotional competence, also display cognitive competencies including the application of proven conceptual thinking, scanning the horizon for information, and strategic thinking. However, Goleman believes “Great leaders go a step further, integrating emotional realities into what they see, and so instilling strategy with meaning and resonance. Their emotional intelligence allows the blending of all of these elements into an inspired vision.”<sup>25</sup> The essential element to developing emotional intelligence is awareness. In larger corporations, according to heads of corporate development efforts, “The biggest problem around here is a lack of self-awareness.”<sup>26</sup>

According to the Emotional Intelligence model, there are five components. They are, knowing one’s emotions, managing emotions, motivating oneself, recognizing emotions in others, and handling relationships. The first three are categorized as competencies which determine how we manage ourselves, while the last two are those which determine how we handle relationships. Under the first component of EI, - knowing one’s emotions - we are focusing on a true self-awareness, or recognizing a feeling as it happens. A greater sense of self-awareness provides the ability to make more realistic assessments of our own capabilities and self-confidence, which channels us to better decision making. If the Myers Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI) is used to assist personnel with understanding *who they are*, there will be a much greater potential of understanding ones preferences in how we collect information or make decisions. This information may support changing or modifying one’s behaviors to achieve different outcomes. Within the second component of EI, managing emotions concerns self-regulation, or managing feelings such that resulting responses are appropriate. Self-regulation builds on self-awareness, and enables one to pursue greater goals, often delaying short term gratification. Those weak in this component consistently battle feelings of distress, while those strong in this trait frequently bounce back more rapidly from personal failure or temporary setbacks. An important personal competence for leaders is the ability to motivate oneself. Another way to say ‘self motivation,’ taking command of one’s emotions is key to paying attention, mastering a subject and being creative. When utilizing this component of EQ, one is forcing themselves to maintain a high level of energy to support outstanding performance at all times.

Leaders with a high degree of this element are usually more productive and effective in reaching goals. They tend to be much more optimistic, displaying a willingness to act when

presented opportunities. Within the components which determine how we handle our relationships with others, or 'social competence', the first is recognizing 'emotions in others.' Otherwise known as empathy, this is fundamentally 'people skills.' How aware is one of others' feelings and perspectives? Those who are low on this component tend to be described as "emotionally tone-deaf." Leaders who are tuned - in to others feelings will receive the signals and convert them into recognizable and actionable 'sound.' The sound takes the form of other perspectives, resulting in an increased quality of relationship and rapport development. Lastly, handling relationships, or the library of social skills one holds, allows one to manage emotions in others. This includes the abilities that support popularity and interpersonal effectiveness. Those strong in social skills excel in activities that rely on interacting smoothly with others. These are the true social stars. These skills support the networking, negotiating, persuading, and leading others. A person demonstrating these skills well may be described as being adept at inducing desirable responses in others. No person has all of these skills locked - up. Goleman states 'people differ in their abilities in each of these five competencies; some of us may be quite adept at handling, say, our own anxiety, but relatively inept at soothing someone else's upsets. The underlying basis for our level of ability is, no doubt, neural, but the brain is remarkably plastic, constantly learning. Lapses in emotional skills can be remedied: to a great extent each of these domains represents a body of habit and response that, with the right effort, can be improved on.'<sup>27</sup> The importance and relevance to a highly dynamic and energetic institution such as the U.S. Navy has yet to be realized on any formal and widespread scale. While a few commands have been willing to invest some of their precious budget on educating their mid-grade officers concerning EI, until the Navy as an institution adopts and embraces this or a similar program, there will be a missed opportunity to develop greater numbers of effective leaders. The above, while not a replacement for, melds well with the Strategic Leadership Metacompetencies addressed in the Strategic Leadership Primer published by the U.S. Army War College.<sup>28</sup>

### **THE 360 DEGREE ASSESSMENT**

The underlying basis for using an alternative assessment is that leader effectiveness and potential should be provided not exclusively by their supervisor but potentially also by all those with whom a person interacts within the work place. Only the lead know for certain the leader's moral courage, consideration for others, and commitment to unit above self.<sup>29</sup> This is the indisputably crucial element in leader assessment and development systems. The 360° feedback process, also called multi-rater assessment, taps the collective wisdom of those who

work most closely with the employee: supervisor, colleagues (peers), direct reports (subordinates), and possibly internal and often external customers. The collective intelligence these people provide on critical competencies or specific behaviors and skill gives the employee a clear understanding of personal strengths and areas ripe for development.<sup>30</sup> Traditional assessment methods tend to focus on specific achievement, efficiency, and alignment with organizational objectives from the view of the immediate supervisor - top down. The organization is left without a strong knowledge of how the member builds teamwork, inspires and motivates, truly sets direction, develops trust between subordinates and supervisors, or creates a learning environment.

In business practice 360-degree feedback is used for three related purposes: as part of the developmental process for individual managers and leaders, to determine group strengths and development needs, and to broaden employee awareness of expected behaviors. In the first instance feedback is used to help develop individual leaders and increase their effectiveness. 360-degree feedback can be used to determine organization wide trends that top management can address in a broad way. Thirdly, 360-degree feedback is often used as a way to inculcate institutional values and expect norms among employees and managers alike. When used to measure individuals, 360-degree feedback can be used as both a self-development tool and as a tool to facilitate promotion.<sup>31</sup>

Among the more important ways by which 360-degree feedback systems add value to organizational development are the following: performance management and continuous learning, tracking change, integration and alignment, and contributing to organizational success through effective implementation.<sup>32</sup> One can hardly imagine a unit which needs the above organizational advantages greater than that of a naval warship. As a naval ship often sails solo, it must be capable of responding to a casualty, and repairing itself. There is no excuse for dead in the water. The ability of the unit to improve performance, learn, track change, integrate and align itself to mission goals therefore is paramount.

Organizations are redesigning their structures for a variety of reasons. When companies remove layers of management, flatten their structure, and begin using self-directed teams, the only practical option for performance feedback is from multiple sources.<sup>33</sup> The 360<sup>o</sup> feedback process enables organizations to broaden the span of control a typical supervisor employs. A common number of subordinates a supervisor evaluates are between three and nine. Under multi-rating assessment programs, supervisors may have as many as seventy subordinates. The overall responsibility of today's supervisor precludes the ability to observe and report on so many individuals.

A supervisor may not have enough technical or expert knowledge to provide credible performance feedback on service-members under their cognizance.<sup>34</sup> The expertise of certain engineering and maintenance functions will benefit significantly by including accurate assessments by others with germane experience.

When the organizational structure has moved from classic supervisory designs to work teams, with leadership dispersed throughout the team, team members offer highly credible performance feedback.<sup>35</sup> Due the nature of the Navy being frequently 'underway,' Tiger Teams are necessarily organized to accomplish arduous and difficult tasks. Consequently, the value of team, versus hierarchical assessment increase in importance, and value.

Many of the potential pitfalls associated with the implementation of 360 degree feedback systems should not sink, but float such an initiative, within an institution such as the Navy. Over-reliance on technology, conversely substituting labor for technology, using ad-hoc technology, administrative overhead, culture shock, autocracy, cronyism, nepotism, supervisor inaction, training, anonymity and confidentiality are some of the issues, which may make acceptance difficult.<sup>36</sup> As the military is a command and control organization, compliance can be mandated.<sup>37</sup> These issues and others are over come by the very nature of a command and control institution.

In regard to training, when the military is not operating, it is training. The Navy is one of the recognized institutions which focuses and executes training programs well. Supervisor inaction is not tolerated and may be dealt with severely. While it may be possible to determine specifically which co-worker provided a specific input, through the use of technology anonymity of the feedback provider may be maximized, and the confidentiality of member scores may be maintained. Incrementalism may not be the Navy's forte, but pilot programs are. In almost every critical, however controversial subject, the Navy has first implemented a pilot program.<sup>38</sup> Whether it is new uniforms, the establishment of a new fitness program, et al, a thoughtful pilot program has enabled the Navy to create successful change. A possible strategy of introducing a pilot program is to use either a class of ship, entire air station or naval base, or one of the current regions which the Navy has been subdivided for administrative purposes. The predictable fear and anxiety Sailors may experience while changing to a 360 degree feedback system can and must be overcome. One of the recipients' criticisms of a 360 degree feedback model includes the feeling of 'over-exposure.' One doesn't enjoy thinking that their boss will read how others view their own shortcomings. On the surface this criticism may appear to have merit however, it is somewhat of a red-herring. A good supervisor is collecting information from a variety of sources on subordinates at all times and developing an opinion on that

subordinate's performance. Now the information is formalized. Also, while Navy evaluations are supposed to be confidential, it is common practice that as soon as they are administered, each sailor compares their ranking and write-up with all other sailors in the shop. It is human nature to want to know where you fall out in the pack. Another criticism, although unvoiced, is that now a person cannot capitalize on essentially one strength to get them by. That is exactly the point. We need to make the selection of future leaders based on as many valid perspectives as possible.

## **CONCLUSION**

We are a winning organization. We have instituted and paid for a great many improvements of the past three years, and you have embraced them and made them better. Because of you, talented American warriors are bringing combat power to bear on the enemies of our country, wherever they may be hiding. We are winning the battle for people in a marketplace full of opportunity. And, we are winning the fight to remake our great institution, to innovate and improve for the dangerous decades ahead.

- ADM Vern Clark, Chief of Naval Operations

ADM Clark's quotation above would seem to give the go-ahead to implementing a 360 degree feedback system. If the concept of "Transformation" means anything in the Navy, it will certainly include the way we evaluate and rate our people. If we are trying to improve our people, we will certainly provide a higher quality of feedback, and one which provides a broader view of whom we are. It will take courage to change the Fitness Report and Evaluation System, but the rewards are absolutely worth the effort. Changing from a culture of formally reviewing from a top-down approach, to a system which includes "up and around" may be difficult, but the failure to do so may result in a Navy which is less than it can be.

The Navy has wrung all it can from the current rating system. Tomorrow's challenges will require the identification of future leaders who can inspire subordinates to new levels of initiative, innovation, commitment and trust, to be swiftly defeat the enemy in the asymmetric 21<sup>st</sup> century battlespace. Today's leader development system of evaluation and promotion are insufficient to support developing the future leaders and necessary supporting culture for the Navy of the future. A complete retooling is required to remove less effective leadership practices and styles to create a transformational organization that can learn and adapt to the future. In the absence of a structural shift in leader evaluation, leading to changes in promotion, and selection, the necessary transformation to the future will either be necessarily delayed or even fail.

“Mission First, Sailor always” must, out of necessity include the “hard work of soft management.” In this case we mean not simply evaluating the performance of a person from one perspective, but doing everything in our power to discover the whole person, and provide a vehicle for feedback, improve all the dimensions of our future leaders.

The Navy is ready now for the evaluation, promotion, and selection of future leaders on all levels using a 360 degree evaluation system which includes subordinates and peers, and not just supervisors. As the promotion and selection of future leaders will be one of the most significant contributions that today’s leadership can provide for tomorrow, the use of a comprehensive feedback tool is essential.

WORD COUNT= 5,024

## ENDNOTES

- <sup>1</sup> ADM Vern Clark, Chief Of Naval Operations, Guidance for 2004.
- <sup>2</sup> Walter W. Tornow and Manuel London and CCL Associates, *Maximizing the Value of 360-Degree Feedback, a process for successful individual and organizational development*. Jossey-Bass Inc., Publishers, San Francisco, CA, 1998, 1.
- <sup>3</sup> Peter F. Drucker, *Management Challenges for the 21<sup>st</sup> Century*. HarperCollins Publishers, Inc., New York, NY, 1999, 101.
- <sup>4</sup> Ibid., 135.
- <sup>5</sup> Peter F. Drucker, *Management Challenges for the 21<sup>st</sup> Century*. HarperCollins Publishers, Inc., New York, NY, 1999, 43.
- <sup>6</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>7</sup> Samuel P. Huntington, *The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of World Order*, Touchstone, Rockefeller Center, New York N.Y. 10020, 1996, 84.
- <sup>8</sup> Mark D. Faram, Quality over quantity: tougher re-up standards, targeted separations top new force cut plans. Navy Times, 21 February 2005, 8.
- <sup>9</sup> Cathal S. O'Connor, "Industry Can Teach Us How to Improve Evaluations." Proceedings (Nov 2004). Database on-line. Available from ProQuest. Accessed 2 December 2004.
- <sup>10</sup> Larry Bossidy and Ram Charan, *Execution*, New York, Crown Business, 2002, 134
- <sup>11</sup> Authors personal knowledge and experience while on the staff of Naval Military Personnel Command.
- <sup>12</sup> Tornow, 80.
- <sup>13</sup> James C. Collins, *Good to great*. HarperCollins Publishers, Inc., New York N.Y. 2001, 41.
- <sup>14</sup> James M. Kouzes and Barry Z. Posner, *The leadership Challenge II*. San Francisco, Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1995. p 30.
- <sup>15</sup> Jon R. Katzenbach, *Teams at the Top: Unleashing the Potential of both Teams and Individual Leaders*. Boston, Harvard Business School Press, 1997, 83.
- <sup>16</sup> Noel M. Tichy, *The Leadership Engine: How Winning Companies Build Leaders at Every Level*, New York, Harper Business, 1997, 3.
- <sup>17</sup> Jon R. Katzenbach, *Teams at the Top: Unleashing the Potential of Both Teams and Individual Leaders*, Boston, Harvard Business School Press, 1997, 84.
- <sup>18</sup> Noel M. Tichy, *The Leadership Engine: How Winning Companies Build Leaders at Every Level*, New York, Harper Business, 1997, 152.

<sup>19</sup> Thomas Teal, *The Human Side of Management*. Harvard Business Review (Nov-Dec 1996), 4.

<sup>20</sup> Ibid.

<sup>21</sup> Ibid.

<sup>22</sup> D.F. Miller, *Leadership: Key to Achieving Successful Results*, Trevanion Group, LCC, 2004.

<sup>23</sup> Daniel Goleman, *Working with Emotional Intelligence* New York, Bantam Books, 1998, 187.

<sup>24</sup> Ibid.

<sup>25</sup> Ibid.

<sup>26</sup> Ibid., 66

<sup>27</sup> Daniel Goleman, *Emotional Intelligence*, New York, Bantam Books, 1995, 44.

<sup>28</sup> COL Stephen A. Shambach, *Strategic Leadership Primer 2<sup>nd</sup> Edition*, Department of Command, Leadership, and Management, U.S. Army War College, 2004.

<sup>29</sup> Walter F. Ulmer, JR. "Military Leadership into the 21<sup>st</sup> Century: Another "Bridge too Far?" Parameters 28 (Spring 1998): 16

<sup>30</sup> Mark R. Edwards, *360<sup>o</sup> FEEDBACK: the powerful new model for employee assessment & performance improvement*. New York, N.Y.: AMACOM, 1996, 4.

<sup>31</sup> Cynthia D. McCauley, Russ S. Moxley, and Ellen Van Velsco. *The Center For Creative Leadership Handbook of Leadership Development*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-bass, 1999, 39-40.

<sup>32</sup> Tornow, 89.

<sup>33</sup> Edwards, 11.

<sup>34</sup> Ibid., 12.

<sup>35</sup> Ibid., 13.

<sup>36</sup> Edwards, 147-158.

<sup>37</sup> Tornow, 71.

<sup>38</sup> Ibid., 72.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Bersin, Josh, "Executive Education: The US Navy Uses E-Learning to Expand Reach and Range, August 2003; available from <[http://www.bersin.com/tips\\_techniques/avg-mgmtmflag.asp](http://www.bersin.com/tips_techniques/avg-mgmtmflag.asp)>. Internet; accessed 9 December 2004.
- Bossidy, Larry and Ram Charan, *Execution*, New York, Crown Business, 2002.
- Ciampaglio, Timothy. "Good Leadership is the same everywhere." Proceedings (Sep 2004): Database on-line. Available from ProQuest. Accessed 2 December 2004.
- Collins, James C. *Good to great*. HarperCollins Publishers, Inc., 2001.
- Combs, Douglas and Fred Kacher. "Learning from the Masters." *Proceedings* (January 2004).
- Drucker, Peter F. *Management Challenges for the 21<sup>st</sup> Century*. HarperCollins Publishers, Inc., New York, NY, 1999.
- Drucker, Peter F. *Managing in the next Society*. St. Martin's Press, 175 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10010, 2002.
- Edwards, Mark R. and Ewen, J. Ann., *360<sup>o</sup> FEEDBACK: the powerful new model for employee assessment & performance improvement*. New York, N.Y.: AMACOM, 1996.
- England, Gordon. Forrestal Lecture Series, U. S. Naval Academy, Principles of Leadership. Undated; available from <<http://www.chinfo.inavy.mil/navpallib/pwople/secnav/eng-principles.html>>; Internet. Access 16 December 2004.
- Faram, Mark D., 360 author sees idea return home. *Navy Times*, 17 January 2005
- Faram, Mark D., Quality over quantity: tougher re-up standards, targeted separations top new force cut plans. *Navy Times*, 21 February 18, 2005.
- Goleman, Daniel, *Emotional Intelligence*, New York, Bantam Books, 1995.
- Goleman, Daniel, *Working with Emotional Intelligence* New York, Bantam Books, 1998,
- Gerras, Stephen J. *The Army as a Learning Organization*. Strategy Research Project. Carlisle Barracks: U.S. Army War College, 3 March 2002.
- Huntington, Samuel P., *The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of World Order*, Touchstone, Rockefeller Center, New York N.Y. 10020, 1996.
- Jones, Steven M. *Improving Accountability for Effective Command Climate: A Strategic Imperative*. Strategy Research Project. Carlisle Barracks: U.S. Army War College, 7 April 2003.
- Joyce, Amy. "They Love You. They Love You Not.; Reviews by Employees May Not Go Down Well, but the Brass Needs Feedback," *The Washington Post* (17 Nov 2002): Database on-line. Available from ProQuest. Accessed 6 December 2004.

- Kouzes, James M. and Barry Z. Posner. *The Leadership Challenge*. San Francisco, CA.: Jossey-Bass, 2002.
- O'Connor, Cathal S. "Industry Can Teach Us How to Improve Evaluations." Proceedings (Nov 2004). Database on-line. Available from ProQuest. Accessed 2 December 2004.
- McCauley, D. McCauley, Russ S. Moxley, and Ellen Van Velso. *The Center For Creative Leadership Handbook of Leadership Development*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-bass, 1999.
- Philpott, Tom, Transforming the Forces, an interview with VADM (Ret) A. K. Cebrowski, The Retired Officer, April 2002.
- Reese, Timothy R. Transforming the Officer Evaluation System: Using a 360-Degree Feedback Model. Strategy Research Project. Carlisle Barracks: U.S. Army War College, 9 April 2002.
- Roberts, Wess. *Leadership secrets of Attila the Hun*. Warner Books, Inc. New York, NY, 1989.
- Schembach, Stephen A., *Strategic Leadership Primer 2<sup>nd</sup> Edition*, Department of Command, Leadership, and Management, U.S. Army War College, 2004.
- Senge, Peter M. *The Fifth Discipline*. New York, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1994.
- Tichey, Noel M. *The Leadership Engine: How Winning Companies Build Leaders at Every Level*, New York, Harper Business, 1997.
- Tornow, Walter W. and Manuel London, and CCL Associates. *Maximizing the value of 360-degree feedback: a process for successful individual and organizational development*. Jossey-Bass Inc., Publishers, San Francisco, CA, 1998.
- Ulmer, LTC (Ret) Walter F. Jr., Military Leadership into the 21<sup>st</sup> Century: Another "Bridge Too Far?" *Parameters* 28 (Spring 1998).
- Whiteside. "From One to Three Sixty: Assessing Leaders." *Military Review* (Sep/Oct 2004): Database on-line. Available from ProQuest. Accessed 2 December 2004.
- Yukl, Gary A. *Leadership in organizations*. Prentice-Hall, Inc., 2002.