19 February 2025

College of Leadership and Ethics
U.S. Naval War College
Newport, Rhode Island

SYLLABUS AND STUDY GUIDE FOR

Spring, Academic Year 2024-25

FOREWORD

This syllabus provides a comprehensive overview of the Naval War College's Stewardship in the Profession of Arms (SPA) core course for the College of Naval Warfare and the Naval Command College. Along with the SPA Blackboard website, it provides administrative information and session-by-session material to prepare students for class.

SUBMITTED:

//S//
G. H. Baker, Jr, Ed.D.
Director, Stewardship in the Profession of Arms

APPROVED:

//S//
Jeffrey R. Macris, Ph.D
Dean, College of Leadership and Ethics

TABLE OF CONTENTS

STEWARDSHIP IN THE PROFESSION OF ARMS

COURSE OVERVIEW

The Profession of Arms is maintained by leaders who build trust and confidence with the American people they serve. The degree of trust and confidence they foster is based on the combination of the leader's competence and character.

As the global environment continues to evolve, so must those who lead in it. By continuously developing themselves and their people, leaders in the Profession of Arms are better prepared for increasingly complex future roles.

The College of Leadership & Ethics (CLE's) Stewardship in the Profession of Arms (SPA) course allows students to focus on themselves as leaders by reflecting on past performance and identifying potential growth areas. In SPA, students are provided the time, space, tools, guidance, and encouragement to do the hard work. Through reflection and understanding, students develop new competencies, strengthen their character, and enhance their ability to lead in complex environments.

As one student put it, "The past 10 weeks provided a useful array of topics to analyze and strengthen not only us as leaders but also personally. The class provided an opportunity to actively think about how I measured up against what I 'know' and what I 'do'."

Program Learning Outcomes. The U.S. Naval War College's Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs) for the College of Naval Warfare are:

1. Demonstrate joint-warfighting leadership when integrating the instruments of national power across the continuum of competition. (JLAs: 3, 5, 6; DLAs: 1, 2, 5.)
2. Create national security strategies designed for contemporary and future security environments. (JLAs: 4, 5; DLAs: 1, 6.)
3. Apply the organizational and ethical concepts integral to the profession of arms at the strategic level of war. (JLA: 2; DLAs: 1, 2, 5.)
4. Apply theory, history, concepts of sea power, and doctrine through critical thought in professional communication. (JLAs: 1, 3, 4; DLAs: 1, 5, 6.)

The Stewardship in the Profession of Arms course centers on ethical leader development in the Profession of Arms, which is key to maintaining public trust while leading and managing violence in complex environments.

Course Goal:
This course asks students to engage and develop themselves as stewards of the profession of arms, which is understood jointly in the larger context of the national security enterprise. Stewardship speaks to the aspects that are intrinsic to the profession and ought to be sustained and those that must evolve and change over time to meet its obligations to society. Students will gain an appreciation for the

complex environment they will encounter in more senior roles and the imperative that their thinking needs to evolve as they lead in these higher levels. In sum, SPA facilitates opportunities where students learn, apply, and evaluate their abilities to reason ethically within the Profession of Arms.

Course Outcomes:
Students who complete SPA will be able to:

- Analyze their leader and metacognitive abilities,
- Value their role as ethical leaders in the Profession of Arms,
- Evaluate how moral philosophy can inform their decision-making,
- Develop a greater sense of self-awareness,
- Enhance their ability to develop self and others as leaders in complex environments.

COURSE FRAMEWORK

There have been many attempts to define the profession of arms. These efforts start with ideas consistent with Huntington's 1957 model. They are mostly descriptive definitions, articulating what a profession is or its expected characteristics. They do not explain how one becomes a professional within their profession. As individual leaders, we ARE the profession. As such, we have the responsibility to grow ourselves and those we lead in a way consistent with our profession's expectations. This course provides a more prescriptive view of what leaders must do to fulfill this professional obligation. The core components are:

Reflection - Understanding – Acceptance – Commitment

Reflection: Leaders in a profession must take an internal inventory to establish their starting point as a reference for further growth. We all think we know who we are, but who you think you are doesn't matter. What matters is how others see you. Good leadership is based on an ability to influence others to achieve objectives. This requires developing relationships that allow others to be internally motivated enough to follow along. Those relationships include a host of dynamics based on interpersonal interactions. Leaders must examine how others view them to improve as leaders.

Understanding: The special expertise necessary for members in the Profession of Arms extends beyond the technical competence to drive ships, fly aircraft, and support our global operations. Leaders must maintain an intellectual curiosity and take the time to dig deeper into concepts that expose them to personal development opportunities. NLDF 3.0 states, "The intensity of our self-guided learning efforts is perhaps the most direct reflection of our drive to be the best leaders possible." Leaders need to understand the theories, various perspectives, and the science behind factors that influence them in leading. This knowledge provides the contextual framework behind who they are and develops their ability to become more adaptive thinkers.

Acceptance: When we look at ourselves, we must have the humility to acknowledge and accept that some elements of our character are strengths and some are weaknesses. Leaders must understand and

accept that external and cognitive factors influence their decision-making. To develop as leaders, we must examine these factors and their influence on our behaviors, decision-making, and belief systems. We can make better and more informed decisions by accepting that we and those we interact with look at the world through different lenses.

Commitment: Unlike the many descriptive views on what comprises a profession, this course requires leaders to internalize their commitment and act as stewards of their profession. As leaders in a profession, our fundamental responsibility requires a deliberate, active role in maintaining the profession. As we develop others and ourselves, we fulfill our obligation to preserve our profession.

COURSE STRUCTURE

This course consists of ten sessions designed to build upon each other. The first six lessons focus on the individual. The first stepping stones take us from humility (I don't know everything) to moral philosophy (how do I know what is right?) to self-awareness (how do others see me?) and through decision science (heuristics & biases). Next, we examine Snowden's environmental complexity and Kegan's mental complexity (vertical development). In these lessons, students reflect and write about themselves as they connect theory to personal experience via the Kolb learning cycle.

As the course flows, students develop a deeper sense of their role in their profession. They also gain an appreciation for how reflection, understanding, acceptance, and commitment significantly impact their personal development. A key course objective is for students to value reflection. As one student put it, "Self-reflection is important. If this class made me realize anything, in addition to the lessons presented, it was that my growth went unchecked. I grew, but it was without reflection."

The course concludes with a capstone exercise that combines the previous nine sessions. Students prepare a Personal Leader Development Plan (PLDP) on what to do with what they have learned in the course.

COURSE REQUIREMENTS

1) ***Student Responsibilities***: Students must fully prepare for each session and contribute actively and positively to classroom discussions. An inquisitive attitude and willingness to engage are essential for a successful graduate-level seminar experience.

2) ***Workload***: The workload throughout the course requires a manageable level of preparation. Stewardship in the Profession of Arms (SPA) is a graduate-level course that generally requires three hours of student preparation for every seminar-hour convening. However, a significant peak in workload unavoidably occurs toward the end of the trimester when multiple-course papers and exams are due. Successful students will plan.

3) ***Session Prerequisites***: Students must complete all "Read/Watch" items listed in the weekly session folder in Blackboard (Bb) prior to class. These readings and videos serve as a basis for an informed seminar discussion. Supplemental readings are useful for students seeking more information on the session's topics.

4) ***Assignments***: This course includes five Reflection Assignments, a final Academic Paper, and a Personal Leader Development Plan (PLDP) Presentation. Students will also use the Discussion Boards to capture their thoughts regarding the course content. Details for these assignments are on Blackboard (Bb).

a) Reflection Assignments allow students to connect the course material to their experiences. These written assignments count toward the student's Class Engagement grade. Students are expected to incorporate instructor feedback from week to week. See Bb for details, rubric, and due dates.

b) Due toward the end of the course, the **Academic Paper** expects students to apply course content and class discussions to their continued leader development. This written assignment builds on the previous Reflection Assignments and counts for **50%** of the student's overall grade. See Bb for details, rubric, and due date.

c) Class Engagement includes both in-class contribution and the effort students put into their written assignments. Class Engagement for the **first half** of the course counts for **20%** of the student's overall grade. This is the sum of in-class contribution and effort in the five Reflection Assignments. Class Engagement for the **second half** of the course counts for an additional **20%** of the student's overall grade. This is the sum of in-class contribution and effort in the PLDP Presentation.

d) Discussion Boards (DBs) are designed to capture the student's interests and learning in each lesson as the course progresses. Unlike traditional DBs, students are not required to comment on other students' posts. DB activities count for **10%** of the student's overall grade.

5) ***Non-IMAP Students***: Except for the Academic Paper, International students who are **not enrolled** in the International Master of Arts Program (**non-IMAP**) must complete course requirements when present. Completing the Academic Paper is optional for non-IMAP students. Non-IMAP students are not required to participate in the course when they are away in the Field Studies Program.

6) ***Tutorials***. Students will meet with faculty outside of class to review their Reflection Assignments and examine student ideas about their final Academic Paper. Students should view these sessions as an aid in preparing their essays. Students are ultimately responsible for the shape of their Academic Paper. Either students or professors may request additional meetings as necessary.

In-Class Contribution. Students are assessed by the quality of their in-class contributions. It's not the number of times a student speaks but how well they demonstrate an understanding of the subject matter, enrich the discussion, and contribute to positive learning. This requires students to listen attentively, think critically, and offer informed comments. In-class contribution will be graded at the end of the term according to the following standards:

A+ (97-100): Contributions indicate brilliance through a new understanding of the topic. The quality of contributions to discussions demonstrates exceptional preparation for each session. Strikes an outstanding balance between "listening" and "contributing."

A (94-96): The contribution is always of superior quality. The student unfailingly thinks through the issue at hand before commenting. The student arrives prepared for every seminar. The contributions are highlighted by insightful thought and understanding and contain some original interpretations of complex concepts.

A- (90-93): Fully engaged in seminar discussions and commands the respect of colleagues through the insightful quality of contributions and ability to listen to and analyze the comments of others, above the average expected of a graduate student.

B+ (87-89): A positive contributor to seminar meetings who joins in most discussions and whose contributions reflect an understanding of the material. Occasionally contributes original and well-developed insights.

B (84-86): Average graduate-level contribution. Involvement in discussions reflects adequate preparation for the seminar with the occasional contribution of original and insightful thought but may not adequately consider others' contributions.

B- (80-83): Contributes but sometimes speaks out without thinking through the issue well enough to marshal logical supporting evidence, address counterarguments, or present a structurally sound position—minimally acceptable graduate-level preparation for the seminar.

C+ (77-79): Sometimes contributes voluntarily, though more frequently needs to be encouraged to participate in discussions—content to allow others to take the lead. Minimal preparation for the seminar is reflected in arguments that lack the support, structure, or clarity to merit graduate credit.

C (74-76): Contribution is marginal. Occasionally, attempts to put forward a plausible opinion, but the inadequate use of evidence, incoherent logical structure, and critically unclear quality of insight are insufficient to examine the issue adequately. Usually, content to let others conduct the seminar discussions.

C- (70-73): Lack of contribution to seminar discussions reflects substandard session preparation. Unable to articulate a responsible opinion. Sometimes displays a negative attitude.

D (56-69): Rarely prepared or engaged. Contributions are infrequent and reflect below minimum acceptable understanding of course material. Engages in frequent fact-free conversations.

F (0-55): The student demonstrates unacceptable preparation and fails to contribute substantively. The student may be extremely disruptive or uncooperative and completely unprepared for the seminar.

Written Grading Criteria

Common standards for numeric and associated letter grades for individual written assignments are:

Letter Grade	Numeric Range	Description
A+	97-100	Work of very high quality. Clearly above the average graduate level.
A	94-96	
A-	90-93	
B+	87-89	

B	84-86	Expected performance of the average graduate student.
B-	80-83	
C+	77-79	Below the average performance expected for graduate work.
C	74-76	
C-	70-73	
D+	67-69	Well below the average performance expected for graduate work.
D	64-66	
D-	60-63	
F	0-59	Unsatisfactory work.

FINAL COURSE GRADE: Grades assigned for the course are expressed in whole numbers and corresponding letter grades, as shown above. A final course grade will be expressed as the numerical weighted average of the student's written assignments and seminar contributions. U.S. resident and IMAP students must earn a final grade of **80 or above** to meet the Naval War College Master of Arts Degree requirements and be eligible for JPME certification.

1 – The Profession of Arms

Focus

This session introduces students to the course's overall framework. The course takes a contemporary view of the profession of arms, examines the importance of individual growth, and stresses personal leader development.

Objectives

- Understand the 'Why' of the SPA course.
- Analyze traditional versus contemporary views of the Profession of Arms.
- Examine the individual leader's role in shaping the profession's ability to face complex challenges.

Guidance

The assigned readings provide different perspectives on managing personal and organizational development in ambiguous environments and challenging contexts. View them with the perspective of how you see your role as a member of the profession of arms.

Session Prerequisites

Read/Watch:

1. Cavallaro, Liz, "SPA: A Vertical Development Course," *NWC video*, 2022.
2. Johnson, Olenda E., "Fold-In Your Mirrors," *YouTube video,* Aug 20, 2015.
3. Kane, Robert C., Kamena, Gene C., and Lackey, James, "Good or Great: Colonel, It Is Up To You!" *DTIC*, 2011.
4. Howe, P. Gardner, RADM, USN, "Professionalism, leader development key to future." *Naval War College*, Newport, RI, May 19, 2015.
5. DiBella, Anthony J., "Military Leaders and Global Leaders: Contrasts, Contradictions, and Opportunities." *Prism*, 2013.
6. Ryan, Mick, "Mastering the Profession of Arms, Part I: The Enduring Nature." *War on the Rocks*. Feb 08, 2017.
7. Open Letter, "To Support and Defend: Principles of Civilian Control and Best Practices of Civil-Military Relations." *War on the Rocks*. Sep 6, 2022.
8. Singer, Peter W., "Woke Army or Woe Army: What really happened in the social media controversy rocking the force?" *Task & Purpose*. October 12, 2022.
9. EBLS, "8 Things to Know About the Experiential Learning Cycle," *YouTube video*. Aug 3, 2019.

10. Bailey & Rehman, “Don’t Underestimate the Power of Self-Reflection.” *Ascend*. Mar 4, 2022.
11. Hauver, Christopher, “Experiential Learning & Reflection in LPA,” NWC Video, 2024.

Supplemental:

1. Dyer, Gwynne, “War with Gwynne Dyer, Part 3: The Profession of Arms (1983),” *YouTube video*, Jun 25, 2013.
2. Brooks, Risa, “Paradoxes of Professionalism.” *International Security* (2020) 44 (4): 7–44.
3. Gilday, Mike M., “The Charge of Command.” Washington, DC: *Headquarters U.S. Navy*, 2022.
4. Richardson, John M., “Navy leader Development Framework”, Washington, DC: *Headquarters U.S. Navy*, 2018.
5. AF_Volume-2-Leadership.
6. AFDD 1-1_Ldrshp Force Dev.
7. ADP 6-22 Army Leadership and the Profession.
8. Crosbie, Thomas, and Meredith Kleykamp, “Fault Lines of the American Military Profession.” *Armed Forces & Society* 44, no. 3 (Jul 2018): 521–43.
9. Kolb, Alice Y., and David A. Kolb, "Learning Styles and Learning Spaces: Enhancing Experiential Learning in Higher Education." *Academy of Management Learning & Education* 4, no. 2 (2005): 193-212.

Write: See Blackboard (Bb) for:

1. Discussion Board questions (Discussion menu), and
2. Reflection Assignment (Content menu=>Writing Assignments).

Do:

1. Before this session, complete the **Pre-Course survey**.
   a. You will get an email from *noreply@verintvoc.com* with this survey link.
   b. This survey should take under 3 minutes to complete.

OPMEP Requirements

- Supports CJCS Joint Learning Areas 2 and 6 of CJCSI 1800.01F.

2 – Humility, Empathy, and Vulnerability

Focus

This session introduces humility and empathy as key leadership factors. These concepts prepare students for the upcoming sessions on *Moral Perspectives* and *Self-Assessment* as tools to guide development goals.

Objectives

- Develop self-awareness and empathy for others.
- Evaluate the importance of trust, humility, and vulnerability in relationships.

Guidance

Humility and empathy are trending concepts in leadership, but they also have deep roots in ethical and philosophical study. As we grow more aware of self-awareness's psychological and neurological components in leading others, we can better understand behavior – our own and others.

Session Prerequisites

Read/Watch:

1. Ramthun, Alex J., "Humble Leaders." *Marine Corps Gazette* 96, no. 2 (02, 2012): 25-27.
2. Hogan, Robert, “Robert Hogan on the Importance of Humility in Leaders,” *Hogan Assessments*, *YouTube video,* Mar 29, 2020.
3. Brown, Brene´, “Leading with Vulnerability: How being vulnerable can serve—not harm—you as a leader.” TEDxHouston.
4. Goleman, Daniel, “The Focused Leader.” *Harvard Business Review*, December 2013.
5. Frei, Frances X and Morris, Anne, “Begin with Trust.” *Harvard Business Review*, May-June 2020.
6. Gourguechon, Prudy, “Empathy Is An Essential Leadership Skill -- And There's Nothing Soft About It.” *Forbes*, Dec 26, 2017.
7. Perel, Esther, "Being An Empathetic Witness," LinkedIn, 2024.
8. Symonds, Matt, Ed., “Hubris,” *YouTube video*, Aug 18, 2015.
9. Kouchaki, Maryam and Smith, Isaac H., “Building an Ethical Career.” *Harvard Business Review*, Jan-Feb 2020.

Supplemental:

1. Wagner, D. R., (1999). "The lost virtue of leadership." *United States Naval Institute. Proceedings*, 125(9), 96-98.
2. Lanaj, Klodiana, Foulk, Trevor A, and Erez, Emir, "How Self Reflection Can Help Leaders Stay Motivated." *Harvard Business Review*, Sep 13, 2018.
3. Wilson, Christina, "How to Improve Your Empathic Listening Skills." *PositivePsychology.com*, 2021.

Write: See Blackboard (Bb) for:

1. Discussion Board question (Discussions menu), and
2. Reflection Assignment (Content menu=>Writing Assignments).

Do:

1. **After this session**, complete the **Moral Perspectives Sorter survey**.
   a. You will get an email from *noreply@verintvoc.com* with this survey link.
   b. This 12-question multiple-choice survey should take 5-7 minutes to complete.

OPMEP Requirements

- Supports CJCS Joint Learning Areas 1, 2, 3, 4, and 6 of CJCSI 1800.01F.

3 – Introduction to Moral Perspectives

Focus

This session exposes students to philosophical perspectives on ethics and demonstrates their applicability to the military profession by using them in analysis and discussion. It draws on Admiral Stockdale's argument that philosophy should be a part of professional military development because it provides tools for dealing with modern leadership challenges.

Objectives

- Develop a basic understanding of the four major moral perspectives.
- Apply those perspectives to challenges within the Profession of Arms.

Guidance

In one sense, philosophy is a form of character development in that it helps you frame choices in moral terms to make better decisions that align with the principles to which you (or your profession) adhere. It can also increase resiliency and the ability to cope with stress. Finally, philosophy can enhance your ability to cope with complexity by giving you access to different perspectives. Philosophy can be extremely challenging, and this course has insufficient time to delve deeply into any one school of thought, much less several. As a result, this session focuses on practical aspects of the major philosophical schools: Virtue Ethics, Duty Ethics, Consequentialist Ethics, and Care Ethics.

Session Prerequisites

Read/Watch:

1. Shanks Kaurin, Pauline, "The Four Major Moral Perspectives." Naval War College Lecture. Blackboard.
2. Shanks Kaurin, Pauline, "The Four Major Moral Perspectives." Naval War College Lecture Slides. Blackboard.
3. Shanks Kaurin, Pauline, "Ethics: Starting at the Beginning." *The Wavell Room*. Aug 21, 2018. Accessed July 17, 2019.
4. "Ethics Explainer: Virtue Ethics." The Ethics Centre. 2016.
5. "Ethics Explainer: Deontology." The Ethics Centre. 2016.
6. "Ethics Explainer: Consequentialism." The Ethics Centre. 2016.
7. D'Olimpio, Laura, "Ethics Explainer: Ethics of Care." The Ethics Centre. 2019.
8. May, Todd, "Decency Toward Those Around Us," in *The Decent Life*, University of Chicago Press, 2019.
9. Le Guin, Ursula K., "The Ones Who Walk Away from Omelas." Harper & Row. 1975.

Write: See Blackboard (Bb) for:

1. Discussion Board question (Discussions menu), and
2. Reflection Assignment (Content menu=>Writing Assignments).

Do:

1. Complete the **Moral Perspectives Sorter survey**.
   c. You should have received an email from *noreply@verintvoc.com* with this survey link.
   d. This 12-question multiple-choice survey should take 5-7 minutes to complete.
2. **After this session**, complete the **High Potential Trait Indicator (HPTI)** assessment.
   a. You will get an email from Thomas International (*invitation@thomasinternational.net*).
   b. Subj: *Invitation to Complete an HPTI Assessment*.
   c. This instrument should take under 10 minutes to complete.

OPMEP Requirements

- Supports CJCS Joint Learning Areas 1, 2, 3, 4, and 6 of CJCSI 1800.01F.

4 – Self-Assessment

Focus

Students will be debriefed on the personality assessment conducted before this session. The seminar will discuss these results, and through the information obtained through the self-assessment, students will explore the importance of individual reflection and how they might best use it.

Objectives

- Understand the results of the personality assessment tool and its importance.
- Introduce the idea of individual reflection as it applies to self-assessment.
- Assess individual traits and the relationship between self-awareness and leader development.

Guidance

Character is a major component in how we see ourselves and how we see and judge others. Like many concepts in this course, everyone knows what character is but can rarely articulate it, much less do so succinctly and accurately. Character is inextricably linked to self-awareness, leadership, and mentoring. Personal assessments should be viewed as an opportunity to identify new doors that can be opened to further develop as a leader and gaps that could be addressed.

Session Prerequisites

Read/Watch:

1. Andersen, Gene, “Self-Awareness for Leaders.” Naval War College Lecture. Blackboard.
2. Andersen, Gene, “Self-Awareness for Leaders.” Naval War College Lecture Slides. Blackboard.
3. Kaufman, Scott B., “Can Personality Be Changed?” *The Atlantic*, Jul 26, 2016.
4. Sharot, Tali, "How to Motivate Yourself to Change Your Behavior," *YouTube video*. Oct 28, 2014.
5. Gerras, Stephen J. and Leonard Wong, “Moving Beyond the MBTI.” *Military Review* Mar-Apr 2016, pages 54-57.
6. “Strategies for Developing HPTI Traits.” *Thomas International*. 2018.
7. Banaji et al., “How (Un)ethical Are You?” *Harvard Business Review*. Dec 2003.

Supplemental:

1. "HPTI Combinations." Thomas International. 2018.
2. Özbağ, Gönül K., "The Role of Personality in Leadership." *Procedia*. 2016.
3. "Reaching New Heights." Thomas-Whitepaper. 2018.

Write: See Blackboard (Bb) for:

1. Discussion Board question (Discussions menu), and
2. Reflection Assignment (Content menu=>Writing Assignments).

Do:

1. Complete the **High Potential Trait Indicator (HPTI)** assessment.
   a. You will get an email from Thomas International (*invitation@thomasinternational.net*).
   b. Subj: *Invitation to Complete an HPTI Assessment*.
   c. This instrument should take under 10 minutes to complete.

OPMEP Requirements

- Supports CJCS Joint Learning Areas 1, 2, 3, 4, and 6 of CJCSI 1800.01F.

5 – Complexity and Decision-Making

Focus

This session introduces some fundamental concepts of decision science.

Objectives

- Assess the various factors and contexts that are critical to decision-making.
- Examine how different environments impact decision-making.
- Evaluate how heuristics and biases affect decision-making.

Guidance

Everyone makes decisions. Decision science shows us that we combine feeling, knowledge, and intuition when we make decisions. Too often we oversimplify these decisions, ignoring facts that do not conform to our perception of reality and ultimately making the wrong decision. This is not about hindsight but about opening our minds to seeing what is around us, not just what we want to see. Leveraging work by Paul J.H. Schoemaker, J. Edward Russo, Daniel Kahneman, and Amos Tversky, we now understand far more about how we make decisions than ever. The student's goal is to take what you have learned about your personality in the self-assessment tool and apply that knowledge to decision-making.

Session Prerequisites

Read/Watch:

1. Kahneman, Daniel, "System-1 & 2 Thinking," *YouTube video*, Nov 10, 2011.
2. Williams, B. S., (2010), "Heuristics and Biases in Military Decision Making," *Military Review*, 90(5), 40-52.
3. Baker, George, (2020). "Heuristics and Biases." *Blackboard Handout*.
4. Syed, Matthew, (2019). "Pursuing Cognitive Diversity," *YouTube video*, Sep 20, 2019.
5. Bazerman, Max H., and Chugh, Dolly, "Decisions Without Blinders." *Harvard Business Review*, Jan 2006.
6. Brown, Brené and Guillen, Barrett, "Braving Trust." Spotify, *Podcast*.
7. Luttrell, Andy, "Cognitive Dissonance Theory," *YouTube video*, Jul 7, 2016.
8. Berger, Jennifer, "Making Sense of Complexity," *YouTube video*, Jul 24, 2017.

Supplemental:

1. Snowden, David, "Embrace Complexity, Scale Agility," *YouTube video*, Apr 16, 2015.
2. Snowden, David, “The Cynefin Framework,” *YouTube video*, Jul 11, 2010.
3. Berger, Jennifer, “Safe to Fail Experiments,” *YouTube video*, Apr 23, 2018.
4. Kahneman, Daniel, and Klein, Gary. “Conditions for intuitive expertise: A failure to disagree.” *American Psychologist*. September 2009.
5. McKee, Guian, Ed. "Lyndon Johnson and McGeorge Bundy Transcript." (May 27, 1964).
6. Richardson, Jessie (2021). “Biases Poster.” *School of Thought*.
7. Richardson, Jessie (2021). “Fallacies Poster.” *School of Thought*.
8. Richardson, Jessie (2021). “Creative Thinking Poster.” *School of Thought*.

Write: See Blackboard (Bb) for:

1. Discussion Board question (Discussions menu), and
2. Reflection Assignment (Content menu=>Writing Assignments).

OPMEP Requirements

- Supports CJCS Joint Learning Areas 1, 2, 3, 4, and 6 of CJCSI 1800.01F.

6 – Complexity and Vertical Development

Focus

In this session, students examine a framework for differentiating types of challenges, and consider how the environment shapes personal development. Students reflect on how people interact and develop within complex environments, and how complexity can shape leadership approaches.

Objectives

- Analyze leadership approaches in different environments.
- Assess the role of mental complexity in developing self and others.
- Evaluate how mental complexity impacts human relationships.

Guidance

The assigned readings survey different perspectives on managing organizational development in ambiguous environments and challenging contexts. Consider how mental complexity applies to leading and developing others at operational and strategic levels. It is often said that "what got you here won't get you there." How can you grow in mental complexity?

Session Prerequisites

Read/Watch:

1. Powell, Colin, "Spheres and Pyramids," In *It Worked for Me*, Harper Collins, 2010.
2. Hill, Ryan, "Thinking Like a Round Table Leader," *Journal of Character & Leadership Development*, 8:1, 2021.
3. Cavallaro, Liz, "Complexity and Vertical Development," Naval War College Lecture, *Blackboard*.
4. Cavallaro, Liz, "Complexity and Vertical Development," Naval War College Lecture Slides, *Blackboard*.
5. Wignall, N., "Adaptive Thinking: The Mental Mechanics of High-Performers," *The Startup*, Feb 2019.
6. Berger, Jennifer, "Adult Development Map," *YouTube video*, Aug 31, 2018.
7. Kashdan, Todd B., "Misunderstandings of Intellectual Humility," *Psychology Today*, Jan 17, 2024.

Supplemental:

1. Fuller, David, “Robert Kegan: The Evolution of the Self,” *YouTube video*, May 31, 2019.
2. Baker, George, (2021). “Outline on Kegan Interview.” *Blackboard Handout*.
3. Yukawa, Joyce, “Preparing for Complexity and Wicked Problems through Transformational Learning Approaches.” *Journal of Education for Library and Information Science*, Vol. 56, No. 2—(Spring) April 2015.

Write: See Blackboard (Bb) for:

1. Discussion Board question (Discussions menu), and
2. Integration Assignment (Content menu=>Writing Assignments).

OPMEP Requirements

- Supports CJCS Joint Learning Areas 1, 2, 3, 4, and 6 of CJCSI 1800.01F.

7 – Organizational Culture and Climate

Focus

This session builds upon earlier themes as students consider the roles of culture and climate in organizations. It will provide students with the opportunity to think about how people interact and develop within their organization and how they can shape both people's and organizational outcomes.

Objectives

- Understand the role of organizational climate and culture.
- Assess how leaders impact climate.
- Evaluate how leaders influence and are influenced by organizational culture.
- Evaluate the relationship between organizational culture, strategy, and leadership.

Guidance

Effective perspective relies upon recognizing and understanding how personal and cultural differences shape perception, communication, and decision-making. Before this session, your moderator will provide detailed position questions. Read the assigned case study, keeping these questions in mind. After reading the assignment, use the case to examine the role of perspective in the decision-making process.

Session Prerequisites

Read/Watch:

1. Chatman, Jennifer A., and O'Reilly, Charles A., "Paradigm Lost: Reinvigorating the Study of Organizational Culture," *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 36 (2016), 199-224.
2. Hofstede, Gert Jan, "Culture's Causes: The Next Challenge," *Cross-Cultural Management* 22, no. 4 (2015): 545-569.
3. Baker, George, (2020). "Hofstede's National Culture Dimensions," *Blackboard Handout*.
4. Kotter, John P., "Leading Change: Why Transformation Efforts Fail," *Harvard Business Review,* May-Jun 1995.
5. Groysberg, Boris, Jeremiah Lee, Jesse Price, and J. Yo-Jud Cheng, "The Leader's Guide to Corporate Culture," *Harvard Business Review*, Jan-Feb 2018, 3-10

6. Dweck, Carol, “The Growth Mindset,” *YouTube video*, Jul 16, 2015.
7. Syed, Matthew, "Why You Should Have Your Own Black Box," *YouTube video*, May 31, 2016.
8. Marquet, David, “What is Leadership?” *YouTube video*, May 17, 2014.

Supplemental:

1. Burkus, David, “How to Tell if Your Company Has a Creative Culture.” *Harvard Business Review*, 2014.
2. Multiple Authors, “Nine Videos on Organizational Culture and Change.” *YouTube video*.
3. Harwood, Shawn, "Adaptive Standard Operating Procedures for Complex Disasters." *Homeland Security Affairs*. Mar 2017.
4. Wong, Leonard, and Gerras, Stephen J., "Lying to Ourselves: Dishonesty in the Army Profession.” *Strategic Studies Institute*, 2015.

Write: See Blackboard (Bb) for:

1. Discussion Board question (Discussions menu button).

OPMEP Requirements

- Supports CJCS Joint Learning Areas 1, 2, 3, 4, and 6 of CJCSI 1800.01F.

8 – Perspective-Taking and Understanding

Focus

This session is designed to deepen the students' practice of self-awareness, independent thought, and problem-framing. Students should integrate concepts addressed in earlier sessions on the Profession of Arms, Moral Foundations, Humility & Empathy, Self-Assessment, Decision Making, and Mental Complexity. Students can use a case study and a faculty-provided in-class exercise to practice perspective-taking through reading, discussion, and reflection.

Objectives

- Apply information to discover different patterns and connections between ideas.
- Examine complex problems to discover competing interpretations.
- Comprehend how subject-object relationships and mental complexity can shape a leader's ability to frame problems effectively.

Guidance

Effective perspective relies upon recognizing and understanding how personal and cultural differences shape perception, communication, and decision-making. Before this session, your moderator will provide detailed position questions. Read the assigned case study, keeping these questions in mind. After reading the assignment, use the case to examine the role of perspective in the decision-making process.

Session Prerequisites

Read/Watch:

1. Perspective-taking Case Study (Faculty Provided).
2. Multiple Authors, "Perspective-taking Videos." *YouTube video*.
3. The Business Voice, "Daniel Goleman on the Different Kinds of Empathy." *YouTube video*, Oct 22, 2015.
4. Platt, Michael., Ludwig, Vera., Johnson, Elizabeth., and Hugander, Per., "Perspective Taking - A Brain Hack That Can Help You Make Better Decisions." *Innovation*, Knowledge@Wharton, Mar 2021.

Supplemental:

1. Hood, Gavin, “Eye in the Sky.” *Entertainment One*, 2016.
2. Baker, George, (2021). “Eye in the Sky Characters.” *Blackboard Handout*.
3. Baker, George, (2021). “Eye in the Sky Timeline.” *Blackboard Handout*.
4. Ku, Gillian; Wang, Cynthia S; Galinsky, Adam D., “The Promise and Perversity of Perspective-taking in Organizations.” *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 2015, Volume 35.
5. Brown, Jennifer O., “Leading With A ‘Yes, And.’” Forbes. 2017.
6. Shanks Kaurin, Pauline, “Healing the Wounds of War.” *The Strategy Bridge*, January 5, 2018.
7. Litz, Brett T., et.al., “Defining and Assessing the Syndrome of Moral Injury.” *Frontiers in Psychiatry*, 2022:

Write: See Blackboard (Bb) for:

1. Discussion Board question (Discussions menu).

OPMEP Requirements

- Supports CJCS Joint Learning Areas 1, 2, 3, 4, and 6 of CJCSI 1800.01F.

9 – Organizational Decision-Making

Focus

This session provides methods for improving awareness of personal biases and common heuristics used in decision-making and explores how to minimize their effects.

Objectives

- Identify, analyze, and apply mitigating strategies to minimize the influence of factors that influence decisions in a complex, joint, interagency, intergovernmental, and multinational strategic environment.
- Analyze how decision-makers consider risk, uncertainty, and complexity in evaluating information through phenomena such as bounded awareness.

Guidance

Recognizing our personal biases and common heuristics, we can now continue working to develop a defense against making poor decisions. Albert Einstein is reported to have said, “If given an hour to save the world, I would spend 55 minutes defining the problem and five minutes finding the solution.” Military personnel often tend towards a bias for action—leaping to a solution without properly defining the problem. This session focuses on waiting, thinking, evaluating, and then acting.

Session Prerequisites

Read/Watch:

1. Organizational Decision-Making Case Study (Faculty Provided).
2. Kahneman, Daniel, "Art & Science of Decision Making." *YouTube video*, Mar 10, 2019.
3. Von Bergen, C.W., & Bressler, M. S., (2015). “Active Waiting as a Business Strategy.” *Journal of Business Strategies*, 32(1).
4. Russo, J. E., & Schoemaker, P. J. H., (1991). “Decision traps and how to avoid them.” *Chemical Engineering*, 98(5), 181.
5. Soll, Jack B., Milkman, Katherine L., and Payne, John W., “Outsmart Your Own Biases.” *Harvard Business Review*, Jan 2006.

Supplemental:

1. Robinson, Adam M., “The Lucky Few.” *Navy Medicine Support Command*.
2. McDonald, Allan J., " Space Shuttle Challenger Disaster: Ethics Case Study No. 1," *YouTube video*, Nov 18, 2015.
3. Teach, E., (2004). “Avoiding decision traps.” *CFO Publication*.
4. Trottier, K., (2017). “Leading under pressure: Evaluating the decision-making style of NHL coaches.” *Sport, Business and Management*, 7(1).
5. Pripoae-Serbanescu, C., (2012). “Psychological Aspects of Military Leader's Decision.” *Strategic Impact*, (42), 141-147.
6. PsychEd, “Milgram's Obedience Experiment,” *YouTube video*, Sep 11, 2019.
7. PsychEd, “The Stanford Prison Experiment (With Real Footage),” *YouTube video*, Apr 24, 2021.
8. Bandura, Albert, “Selective Moral Disengagement in the Exercise of Moral Agency,” Journal of moral education, 2002, Vol.31 (2), p.101-119.
9. Baker, George, (2022). “Moral Disengagement Handout,” *Blackboard Handout*.

Write: See Blackboard (Bb) for:

1. Discussion Board question (Discussions menu).

OPMEP Requirements

- Supports CJCS Joint Learning Areas 1, 2, 3, 4, and 6 of CJCSI 1800.01F.

10 – Personal Leader Development Plan Capstone

Focus

This session culminates the trimester's study. Students will create a personal leader development plan (PLDP) to develop as ethical leaders and decision-makers in complex environments continually.

Objectives

- Engage in a facilitated discussion of individual discoveries during the SPA course. Discuss implications for future roles as leaders in your profession.
- Have an appreciation for continued development as leaders for future roles with the final refinement of their PLDPs.
- Create a capacity to develop as a leader and decision-maker in complex environments continually.

Guidance

Reflect on your work in this course while crafting your PLDP. What epiphanies or realizations have occurred regarding your individual development as a leader for the future? Discuss the implications of these discoveries. How has your perspective evolved as a leader within the profession of arms? What personal challenges will you face as a leader, and how has this course helped you prepare for these challenges?

Session Prerequisites

Read/Watch:

1. Kane, Robert C., Kamena, Gene C., and Lackey, James, (2011). "Good or Great: Colonel, It Is Up to You!" *DTIC*.
2. Davis, Stephen L., and Casey, William W., (Winter 2018). "A Model of Air Force Squadron Vitality." *Aerospace Power Journal*.
3. Andersen, Gene, (2019). "Building a Personal Leader Development Plan." *Blackboard Handout*.
4. *Baker, George, (2021). "PLDP Guidance and PLDP Presentation." Blackboard Handout*.
5. Hill, Ryan, "Two Questions We Should Ask Ourselves Every Day." (2020). *From The Green Notebook*.
6. Ludwig, Dean C., and Clinton O. Longenecker, "The Bathsheba Syndrome: The Ethical Failure of Successful Leaders." Journal of Business Ethics 12, no. 4 (1993): 265–73. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01666530.

Write: See Blackboard (Bb) for:

1. Discussion Board questions (Discussions menu), and
2. My PLDP (Discussions Board menu).

Do:

1. Complete the **End-of-Course survey**.
   a. On Monday, you will get an email from *noreply@verintvoc.com* with the survey link.
   b. The survey should take about 10 minutes to complete.
   c. This survey only covers SPA.

OPMEP Requirements

- Supports CJCS Joint Learning Areas 1, 2, 3, 4, and 6 of CJCSI 1800.01F.