NPS-AM-25-276



ACQUISITION RESEARCH PROGRAM Sponsored report series

Fostering Intrapreneurship to Improve Readiness and Retention: Innovative Behaviors to Bolster the Navy's Talent Management Efforts

September 2024

LT Ashley M. Clavette, USN LCDR Kaitlyn E. Franz, USN LCDR Adam C. Johnson, USN LCDR Diana J. Maeng, USN

Thesis Advisors: Dr. Nicholas Dew, Professor Susan Harker, Lecturer

Department of Defense Management

Naval Postgraduate School

Approved for public release; distribution is unlimited.

Prepared for the Naval Postgraduate School, Monterey, CA 93943.

Disclaimer: The views expressed are those of the author(s) and do not reflect the official policy or position of the Naval Postgraduate School, US Navy, Department of Defense, or the US government.



ACQUISITION RESEARCH PROGRAM Department of Defense Management Naval Postgraduate School

The research presented in this report was supported by the Acquisition Research Program of the Department of Defense Management at the Naval Postgraduate School.

To request defense acquisition research, to become a research sponsor, or to print additional copies of reports, please contact the Acquisition Research Program (ARP) via email, arp@nps.edu or at 831-656-3793.



ABSTRACT

The United States Navy (USN) is facing challenges in its continuous efforts to leverage the full creative potential of its junior workforce to drive grassroots innovation and meet operational readiness and retention goals. Despite sincere intent and encouraging rhetoric from senior leaders, the Navy is not experiencing the level of junior officer (JO) engagement within its problem-solving and innovation ecosystems needed to noticeably impact performance, readiness, and modernization objectives. Conversely, JO feedback is often bottlenecked at the tactical level within occupationally constrained designator silos commonly known as communities. This thesis explores deliberately fostering intrapreneurship among tactical-level leaders as a method to release the large pool of untapped insights and deliver them to the appropriate organizational stakeholders, improving operational readiness and creating opportunities for positive retention along with it. Furthermore, this research identifies opportunities and accompanying recommendations for actions the USN can take to generate more bottom-up innovation by analyzing synergy between intrapreneurial behaviors, the Department of Defense's (DoD) Mission Command construct and other related doctrine. Lastly, a Prototype Knowledge Assessment Tool (PKAT) was developed to address JO professional capacity, institutional understanding, and subsequent applicability vulnerabilities.



THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK



ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We would like to sincerely express our deepest gratitude to those who have supported us throughout this journey. First and foremost, we extend our heartfelt thanks to our advisors, Dr. Nicholas Dew, and Susan Harker. Their guidance and support was invaluable in shaping us as learners, naval officers, and human beings.

Furthermore, we extend our appreciation to the Naval Postgraduate School for providing a rich environment in which we were empowered to thrive. Our time here in Monterey has enabled us to explore complex ideas with the full support of an incredible faculty and staff.

Next, we owe special thanks to our families, friends, and peers. Their encouragement and patience were instrumental in bringing this project to fruition. Without their steadfast support, this endeavor would not have been possible.

Lastly, we'd like to acknowledge the primary commands and organizations who provided guidance, insight, and perspective to our research via interviews and consultation. Their collective input was critical in shaping our thoughts into a cohesive body of work. These organizations include the United States Public Health Service (USPHS), Navy Problem Solving Office, the Navy Survey Program Office, the Talent Management Center of Excellence (TMCoE), specifically leadership from the Performance Evaluation Transformation (PET) and Navy Leadership Assessment Program (NLAP) teams.

Thank you all for your time and support.



THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK



NPS-AM-25-276



ACQUISITION RESEARCH PROGRAM Sponsored report series

Fostering Intrapreneurship to Improve Readiness and Retention: Innovative Behaviors to Bolster the Navy's Talent Management Efforts

September 2024

LT Ashley M. Clavette, USN LCDR Kaitlyn E. Franz, USN LCDR Adam C. Johnson, USN LCDR Diana J. Maeng, USN

Thesis Advisors: Dr. Nicholas Dew, Professor Susan Harker, Lecturer

Department of Defense Management

Naval Postgraduate School

Approved for public release; distribution is unlimited.

Prepared for the Naval Postgraduate School, Monterey, CA 93943.

Disclaimer: The views expressed are those of the author(s) and do not reflect the official policy or position of the Naval Postgraduate School, US Navy, Department of Defense, or the US government.



ACQUISITION RESEARCH PROGRAM Department of Defense Management Naval Postgraduate School THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK



TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION1				
	A.	A. PROBLEM STATEMENT			
	B. RESEARCH QUESTIONS			2	
	C.	INF	FORMED FOUNDATION		
		1.	Summary of Intrapreneurship	2	
		2.	A Brief History of Intrapreneurship	3	
		3.	Definition of Intrapreneurship	3	
		4.	Mission Command Characteristics	4	
		5.	Mapping Mission Command Principles and Intrapreneurial Behaviors	7	
II.	ENTREPRENEURSHIP VS. INTRAPRENEURSHIP: SIMILARITIES AND DIFFERENCES				
	A.	INT	RODUCTION	11	
	B.	DIS	TINGUISHING ENTREPRENEURSHIP FROM		
		INT	RAPRENEURSHIP	11	
	C.	. MOTIVATIONAL FACTORS: ENTREPRENEURS VERSUS		13	
		1.	Extrinsic Motivational Factors	13	
		2.	Intrinsic Motivational Factors	13	
		3.	Completing the Comparison: Returning to Miller's Elements	14	
III.	STRATEGIC LINKAGES: MISSION COMMAND, JOINT				
	DEV	ELOP	MENT, AND INTRAPRENEURIAL BEHAVIORS	17	
	A.	INT	RODUCTION	17	
	В.	THE	E ORIGINS AND PRINCIPLES OF MISSION COMMAND	17	
	C.	THE	E ARMY'S RE-EMPHASIS ON MISSION COMMAND	19	
	D.	PRE CON	CFACING JOINT DOCTRINE REVIEW: MISSION MMAND AND MILLER'S PRINCIPLES OF	• •	
		INTRAPRENEURSHIP		20	
	E.	REV	TEW OF JOINT DOCTRINE	21	
		1.	Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff Instruction 1800.01G - Officer Professional Military Education Policy.	21	
		2.	Mapping Intrapreneurial Behaviors with Joint DLA Expectations	23	
		3.	Linking Mission Command and Joint Desired Leader Attributes Through Intrapreneurial Behaviors	25	



		4.	Historical Example: Admiral Horatio Nelson	26
IV.	INNOVATION IN THE NAVY: CURRENT STATUS, CHALLENGES, AND PATH FORWARD			
	A.	INT	RODUCTION	29
	B .	SHC	ORTFALLS IN INNOVATION	29
	C.	CON	NECTING INNOVATION SHORTFALLS TO MISSION	
		CON	MMAND PRINCIPLES	30
	D.	CONNECTING INNOVATION SHORTFALLS TO MILLER'S		
		INT	RAPRENEURIAL BEHAVIORS	31
	E.	ADI	DRESSING INNOVATION CHALLENGES: THE NAVY'S	
		TAL	LENT MANAGEMENT CENTER OF EXCELLENCE	32
	F.	SET	TING THE CONDITIONS: LEVERAGING THE NAVY'S	22
		GEI	TREAL GET BETTER CAMPAIGN	33
V.	IDENTIFYING ENABLERS OF INTRAPRENEURSHIP WITHIN THE NAVAL ENTERPRISE			
			A PLINC INNOVATIVENESS THROUCH	
	Α.	OR	CANIZATIONAL UNDERSTANDING	37
		1	PKAT Design Methodology	30
		1. 2	PKAT Analysis of Alternatives	40
	R	Z. FNA	ARI ING RISK-TAKING THROUGH PERFORMANCE	40
	D,	INCENTIVES.		42
		1.	Exploring the Navy's Fitness Reporting System for	
			Intrapreneurial Elements	43
		2.	Case Study: United States Public Health Service's	
			Commissioned Officers Effectiveness Report	45
		3.	Parallel Insights: The Army's Officer Effectiveness	
			Report	46
	C.	ENA	ABLING PROACTIVENESS THROUGH	
		ORC	GANIZATIONAL TRUST	47
		1.	Barriers to Proactive Leadership in the Navy	48
		2.	Building Trust: The Navy's Leadership Assessment Efforts	50
VI.	FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS			
	А.	INT	RODUCTION	53
	B.	FIN	DINGS	53
	C.	CONCLUSION 5		54
	D.	PRI	MARY RECOMMENDATIONS	55
		1.	Test and Refine PKAT Effectiveness	55



	2. Enhance the Navy's Performance Evaluation System	55
	3. Integrating Intrapreneurial Behaviors into Leadership	
	Curricula	56
	4. Define and Promulgate Comprehensive Innovation	56
Г	FUNCIES	30 56
E.	L ongitudinal Studios	50
	1. Longitudinal Studies	50
	2. Cross-Dranch Comparisons	57
	5. International Benchmarks	57
	4. Technology Integration	
	5. Impact of Organizational Culture	57
APPENDIX	A. PROTOTYPE KNOWLEDGE ASSESSMENT TOOL	59
А.	BACKGROUND	59
В.	SCOPE	59
C.	RELEVANCE TO MILLER'S PRINCIPLE OF	
	INNOVATIVENESS	59
D.	WORK DISTRIBUTION STRATEGY	60
	1. Strategic Selection of Developers	60
	2. Educational and Professional Background	60
Е.	NAVY SURVEY EXPERIENCES: IMPACT ON PKAT	
	DEVELOPMENT	61
	1. Survey Fatigue Mitigation	61
	2. Focus on Actionable Insights	61
F.	PKAT DEVELOPMENT PROCESS	61
G.	ANALYSIS OF ALTERNATIVES	64
H.	INTRODUCTION TO ENHANCEMENT TOOLS	67
I.	ASSESSING INTRAPRENEURIAL RELEVANCE AND	
	POTENTIAL FOR BROADER APPLICATION	68
J.	ALIGNMENT WITH PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION AND	
	RETENTION GOALS	70
К.	NAVY JUNIOR OFFICER PROTOTYPE KNOWLEDGE	
	ASSESSMENT TOOL :	72
APPENDIX	X B. EVALUATIONS	93
LIST OF R	EFERENCES	103



THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK



LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1.	Mapping Intrapreneurial Behaviors to Mission Command Principles. Adapted from Miller (1983) and U.S. Department of the Army (2019)
Figure 2.	Mapping Intrapreneurial Behaviors with Joint Desired Leader Attributes. Source: (Joint Chiefs of Staff, 2024; Miller 1983)
Figure 3.	Linking Mission Command and Joint Desired Leader Attributes through Intrapreneurial Behaviors. Source: (Joint Chiefs of Staff, 2024; Miller, 1983; U.S. Department of the Army, 2019)
Figure 4.	DAU Innovate to Win model. Source: DAU
Figure 5.	USN FITREP (Front). Source: MyNavyHR (n.d.e)
Figure 6.	USN FITREP (Back). Source: MyNavyHR (n.d.e)
Figure 7.	USPHS Report p.1. Source: Commissioned Corps of the U.S. Public Health Service. (n.d.b.)
Figure 8.	USPHS Report p.2. Source: Commissioned Corps of the U.S. Public Health Service. (n.d.b.)
Figure 9.	USPHS Report p.3. Source: Commissioned Corps of the U.S. Public Health Service. (n.d.b.)
Figure 10.	USPHS Report p.4. Source: Commissioned Corps of the U.S. Public Health Service. (n.d.b.)
Figure 11.	USPHS Report p.5. Source: Commissioned Corps of the U.S. Public Health Service. (n.d.b.)
Figure 12.	Army Officer Evaluation Report p.1. Source: Army Publishing Directorate. (n.d.a.)
Figure 13.	Army Officer Evaluation Report p.2. Source: Army Publishing Directorate. (n.d.a.)



THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK



LIST OF ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

ADP	Army Doctrine Publication
AI	Artificial Intelligence
AoA	Analysis of Alternatives
ASPIRE	All Services Personnel Readiness Engine
CJCSI	Chairman of the Joints Chiefs of Staff Instruction
CoC	Chain of Command
COER	Commissioned Officers' Effectiveness Report
DAU	Defense Acquisition University
DEOCS	Defense Organizational Climate Survey
DIB	Defense Innovation Board
DLA	Desired Leader Attributes
DoD	Department of Defense
DON	Department of the Navy
eNAVFIT	U.S. Navy's Interface for Conducting Evaluations and Fitness Reports
FITREP	Fitness Report
GRGB	Get Real Get Better
HR	Human Resources
JO	JO
JPME	Joint Professional Military Education
LLM	Large Language Model
LPD	Amphibious Transport Dock
MCA	Major Capability Acquisition
NLAP	Navy Leadership Assessment Program
NLDF	Navy Leader Development Framework
NLDS	Navy Learning and Development Strategy
OER	Officer Effectiveness Report
OPMEP	Officer Professional Military Education Policy
PES	Performance Evaluation System
РЕТ	Performance Evaluation Transformation



PHS	Public Health Service
РКАТ	Prototype Knowledge Assessment Tool
PME	Professional Military Education
ТМСоЕ	Navy's Talent Management Center of Excellence
ТҮСОМ	Type Command
U.S.	United States
USN	United States Navy
USPHS	United States Public Health Service



EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The United States Navy (USN) faces significant challenges in leveraging the innovative potential of its junior officers (JO) due to structural and cultural barriers across the enterprise. Despite consistent efforts throughout the Navy's history to solicit feedback from junior personnel, a notable gap in JO problem-solving and innovation continues to negatively impact performance, readiness, and retention goals. The persistence of this gap can be attributed to many factors, chief among them the combination of misaligned incentives and cultural barriers within the Navy's existing organizational structure. In other words, the Navy's professional culture does not adequately generate innovation at the tactical level, perpetuating voids within the chain of command that breed inefficiencies and missed opportunities for systemic improvement.

Intrapreneurship involves leveraging entrepreneurial skills within an organization to drive innovation and optimize routine operations. The term "intrapreneur" was coined by Gifford and Elizabeth Pinchot in the late-1970s, introducing the ideology that employees can and should be encouraged to exhibit entrepreneurial behaviors within their existing corporate environment, enabling them take acceptable risks utilizing resources and support from their employer (Pinchot & Pinchot, 1978).

Our research explores how fostering intrapreneurial behaviors among JOs can drive process enhancements and efficiency gains, ultimately improving operational readiness and bolstering talent management initiatives. By investing in and maintaining robust methodologies to empower, develop, and harness the problem-solving capabilities of frontline leaders, our study aims to enhance the USN's modernization efforts, overall mission effectiveness, and retention goals. Empowering JOs with the tools and autonomy to innovate can bridge the gap between high-level strategy and tactical-level execution of commander's intent.

We employed a multi-method approach, including a comprehensive review of Navy doctrine to identify existing policies related to organizational improvement, innovation, and problem-solving. Our research examines the concept of Mission Command



(2019) to discuss the Department of the Navy's (DON) effectiveness in equipping officers with organizational understanding and problem-solving skills. Our efforts also include analysis of fundamental intrapreneurial behaviors, focusing on their applicability within the Navy environment. Additionally, we assessed the innovation culture within the DON, highlighting current challenges in the modern environment.

Finally, to explore opportunities for practical application, two action-oriented measures were taken, one external to the DON and one tailored to the DON. First, a case study of the United States Public Health Service's (USPHS) Commissioned Officers' Effectiveness Report (COER) was conducted to provide a detailed assessment of how its standards, scoring, and feedback mechanisms incentivize innovation and problem-solving behaviors. Second, a prototype knowledge assessment tool (PKAT) was developed to assess JOs' baseline comprehension of organizational processes, innovation incentives, feedback mechanisms, and resource allocation.

A. KEY FINDINGS

- Intrapreneurial behaviors align closely with Mission Command principles and thereby have potential to bolster the promotion of decentralized decision-making by empowering JOs to innovate more effectively.
- Promotion of intrapreneurial behaviors among JOs directly supports adherence to the Officer Professional Military Education Policy (OPMEP) (2024) Desired Leader Attributes (DLAs) and thereby has potential to positively influence collective retention.
- Existing initiatives to enhance the Navy's performance evaluation system (PES) can be bolstered by deliberately highlighting opportunities for recognition and/or promotion of innovative behaviors among the JO cadre.
- Initial PKAT development revealed the need to leverage modern digital tools and methodologies to deliver tailored knowledge assessment across a wide spectrum of professional warfighting competencies and individual needs.



B. RECOMMENDATIONS

- 1. Test and refine PKAT effectiveness by collecting JO insights and feedback on its performance across multiple units, occupational communities and organizational levels within the DON.
- Enhance the Navy's PES (U.S. Department of the Navy, 2011) to better recognize and promote intrapreneurial behaviors among USN JOs by researching best practices from employment of the USPHS' COER (Department of Health and Human Services, 2021) and the Army's Officer Effectiveness Report (OER) (Department of the Army, 2019b).
- Identify opportunities to integrate intrapreneurial behaviors into existing leadership curricula to bolster acceptance of Mission Command (U.S. Department of the Army, 2019a) principles among USN JOs.
- 4. Promulgate comprehensive and actionable organizational initiatives within existing innovation policies to ensure clarity of commander's intent and access to resources for JOs across all levels of command.

C. REFERENCES

- Department of the Army. (2019a). *Mission command*. Army Doctrine Publication (ADP) No. 6–0.
- Department of the Army. (2019b). *Officer evaluation report* (DA Form 67–10-1). https://armypubs.army.mil/pub/eforms/DR_a/pdf/ARN17085_A67_10_1_FINAL.pdf
- Department of Health and Human Services. (2021). Commissioned officers' effectiveness report (PHS-838). https://dcp.psc.gov/CCMIS/PDF_docs/PHS-838% 20(updated).pdf
- Department of the Navy. (2011). *Navy officer fitness report and counseling record* (NAVPERS 1610/2). https://www.mynavyhr.navy.mil/Portals/55/Reference/ Forms/NAVPERS/NAVPERS_1610-2_Rev11-11.pdf?ver= 4wjZXxOGMBkawQGB2A1Tkw%3d%3d
- Joint Chiefs of Staff. (2024). Officer *professional military education policy*. www.jcs.mil/Portals/36/Documents/Library/Instructions/CJCSI%201800.01G.pdf



Pinchot, G., & Pinchot, E. (1978). *Intra-corporate entrepreneurship*. https://web.archive.org/web/20110713050351/http://www.intrapreneur.com/ MainPages/History/IntraCorp.html



I. INTRODUCTION

Development of this research was supported by the use of Large Language Models (LLMs). They were strictly employed as tools to assist with ideation, brainstorming, and the structuring of content. These LLMs were used in compliance with academic integrity standards and were not utilized to generate drafts or final written products. All written work, submitted for academic credit or review, was independently developed and rigorously reviewed by the authors to ensure adherence to academic and professional standards. The final output reflects original work created and verified through human oversight.

A. PROBLEM STATEMENT

The United States Navy (USN) faces increasing pressure to enhance its operational readiness amidst rapidly evolving global threats and technological advancements. However, practices within its current organizational structure and professional culture inhibit its ability to promote, capture, refine, and implement innovative ideas from its workforce, particularly at the tactical level where it employs the bulk of its junior personnel. Despite a generally positive ideology among senior Navy leadership to actively seek feedback from junior personnel, the organization is not experiencing the level of junior officer (JO) engagement within problem-solving and innovation ecosystems needed to noticeably impact performance readiness and modernization goals. To meet the Navy's expectations for pacing near peer capabilities and threats, there is a critical need to address the aforementioned deficiencies by fostering intrapreneurship among junior leaders to drive process enhancements and efficiency gains with intent to improve operational readiness and bolster the Navy's modernization efforts.

The rationale of this thesis is grounded in a belief that JOs possess unique insights into routine operations. Furthermore, if the Navy can find success in harnessing these insights, it can apply them to realize significant improvements, enterprise wide. By developing systematic methods to empower, develop, and deliver fruits from the collective problem-solving capabilities of frontline leaders, our research aims to enhance the Navy's



modernization efforts and overall mission effectiveness, ultimately contributing to positive retention outcomes, enabling the Navy to keep and shape its talent persistently.

B. RESEARCH QUESTIONS

(1) Primary Question

How can the United States Navy (USN) systematically foster intrapreneurship among JOs to better harness their unique insights, bolster Mission Command effectiveness, and drive grassroots innovation to improve readiness and retention?

- (2) Secondary Questions
- How do intrapreneurial behaviors align with and support Mission Command in the Navy?
- 2. What incentives currently exist within the DON that facilitate and encourage intrapreneurial behavior from JOs?
- **3.** What Department of Defense (DoD) or private organizations have effectively implemented performance-based or promotional incentives to encourage and support intrapreneurial behavior among JOs or their counterparts with similar levels of responsibility?
- 4. How does JO comprehension regarding overarching DON organizational architectures impact their ability to engage in intrapreneurial and problem-solving activities?

C. INFORMED FOUNDATION

1. Summary of Intrapreneurship

Intrapreneurship involves leveraging entrepreneurial skills within an existing organization to drive innovation and optimize operational procedures. The term "intrapreneur" was coined by Gifford and Elizabeth Pinchot in 1978 which introduced the idea of enabling employees to exhibit entrepreneurial behaviors within the corporate environment (Pinchot & Pinchot, 1978). Pinchot and Pinchot's concept presented the



practice of empowering employees to innovate and take risks while utilizing the resources and support of their parent organization.

2. A Brief History of Intrapreneurship

Over the last several decades, intrapreneurship has evolved as a crucial strategy for maintaining competitiveness and profitability within a corporate structure. In Gifford and Elizabeth Pinchot's 1978 white paper, they emphasized the importance of fostering innovation within large corporations, proposing that companies could remain agile and innovative by decentralizing decision-making and creating smaller, more entrepreneurial inclined units or sub-groups within their ranks.

In his 1982 article, Norman Macrae stated that the Pinchots' ideas were transforming business practices. Macrae credited Pinchot and Pinchot with pioneering a movement that encouraged companies to harness internal talent and creativity, creating opportunities to drive significant innovative success. Although leading organizations such as 3M and Lockheed Martin had already successfully implemented intrapreneurial initiatives that resulted in groundbreaking innovations like the Post-it Note and Skunk Works projects, these practices were not formally labeled until Pinchot's efforts were recognized. (Pinchot & Pinchot, 1978; Macrae, 1982).

3. Definition of Intrapreneurship

There are many definitions of intrapreneurship; however, to maintain continuity within this thesis, we have scoped our research to align with the elements of intrapreneurship defined by Danny Miller in 1983. Miller identifies three key elements of intrapreneurship: innovativeness, risk-taking, and proactiveness. Innovativeness refers to the ability to generate new ideas and solutions that improve processes, products, or services. Risk-taking involves engaging in activities with uncertain outcomes and accepting the potential for failure as part of the innovation process. Proactiveness is the tendency to anticipate and act on future opportunities rather than reacting to events as they occur. These dimensions are crucial for fostering a culture of innovation within an organization and are leveraged both as enablers and boundaries for the purpose of this research.



a. Innovativeness

Innovativeness refers to an individual's ability to generate new ideas and solutions that can improve processes, products, or services. It hinges upon the capability of that individual's environment to nurture creativity and their willingness to experiment with new approaches. In large organizations, fostering innovativeness requires that employers provide their employees access to the resources and support to explore new ideas they believe will ultimately benefit the organization. In many cases, resources are available and simply require re-allocation to meet specific needs. In other cases, resources may need to be acquired or even discontinued to remove barriers to innovativeness.

b. Risk-Taking

Risk-taking is the willingness to engage in activities that have uncertain outcomes. It involves and requires the acceptance of potential failures as part of the innovation process. Encouraging risk-taking within an organization necessitates establishing an environment where employees feel safe to take chances with an expectation of healthy accountability, but without fear of negative repercussions.

c. Proactiveness

Proactiveness encompasses an individual's tendency to anticipate and act on future opportunities rather than reacting to events as they occur. It involves being forwardthinking and taking the initiative to address potential challenges and opportunities within the environment. Organizations may promote proactiveness by encouraging employees to be vigilant and attentive to emerging trends and issues as while encouraging healthy dialogue to manage expectations.

4. Mission Command Characteristics

Mission Command is a command philosophy that emphasizes decentralized decision-making and the importance of empowering subordinate leaders to maximize their delegated autonomy and achieve objective goals. According to the 2019 Army Doctrine Publication (ADP) 6–0: Mission Command: Command and Control of Army Forces, Mission Command focuses on the integration of command-and-control activities to enable



agile and adaptive leadership in complex operational environments. The key characteristics of Mission Command from the ADP include:

a. Competence

Ensuring leaders at all levels have the requisite skills and knowledge to make informed decisions autonomously. Competence is built, primarily, through rigorous training, continuous education, and practical experience. By fostering competence within its members, organizations can ensure their subordinate leaders are well-equipped to handle complex situations and make sound decisions aligned with overarching strategic priorities. This element emphasizes the role of leader development in achieving mission success.

b. Mutual Trust

Mutual trust is established through consistent and transparent communication, demonstrated reliability, and a shared commitment to the organization's goals to build and maintain a culture where subordinates feel confident in taking initiative. Trust enables subordinates to feel supported and empowered to make these decisive actions in a timely and transparent manner. Ultimately, mutual trust is foundational for enabling subordinate leaders to operate autonomously within their scope of authority, effectively.

c. Shared Understanding

Shared Understanding involves developing a common grasp of the mission and fundamental objectives across the entire organization. It is achieved by establishing clear communication of the mission's intent, goals, and expected outcomes. Shared understanding ensures that all members are properly aligned and can work cohesively towards and/or give feedback on promulgated objectives. The latter characteristics have potential to aid in synchronizing comprehensive workforce efforts and ensuring that actions taken at all levels are coherent and mutually supportive.



d. Commander's Intent

Commander's intent outlines the purpose and desired outcomes of a mission, giving subordinates the flexibility to adapt their actions as needed while staying focused on the overarching goals. To achieve this, leaders must provide clear guidance on the desired end state of isolated or collective actions, thereby allowing subordinates to align efforts within their autonomy with the overall mission, ultimately increasing adaptability and responsiveness in dynamic operational environments.

e. Mission Orders

Closely related to commander's intent, Mission Orders provide the tangible access to a senior leader's expectations that allow subordinates to align their actions with the desired outcomes. Specifically, commander's intent outlines the purpose of a mission, giving subordinates both compartmentalized tasks and flexibility to adapt their execution of those tasks as needed to achieve overarching goals.

f. Disciplined Initiative

Disciplined initiative involves taking calculated risks and making decisions that support comprehensive mission objectives, even in the absence of explicit orders. To achieve this, it is incumbent upon senior leaders to encourage their subordinates to take proactive steps within the boundaries of their commander's intent. Senior leaders must empower and recognize their teams to act decisively and innovate within their scope of authority.

g. Risk Acceptance

Risk acceptance involves understanding the potential benefits and consequences of actions to make informed decisions and pursue opportunities that can lead to advancements that bolster an organization or unit's effectiveness. Subordinate leaders must be empowered to recognize that taking risks is inherent in military operations and encouraging calculated risk-taking to achieve mission success. The principle of Risk Acceptance underscores the importance of balancing risk and reward in decision-making.



5. Mapping Mission Command Principles and Intrapreneurial Behaviors

The connections we discovered between Miller's (1983) intrapreneurial behaviors—innovativeness, risk-taking, and proactiveness—and the DoD's Mission Command elements are represented in Figure 1 by either a solid or dotted line. Solid lines indicate stronger connections, deliberate relationships where the influence between a given intrapreneurial behavior and corresponding Mission Command is significant and sustained. Red dotted lines, on the other hand, represent nuanced connections, where the relationship is more contextual, heavily contingent upon situational factors.



Figure 1. Mapping Intrapreneurial Behaviors to Mission Command Principles. Adapted from Miller (1983) and U.S. Department of the Army (2019).



(1) Innovativeness and Competence (Strong)

We found that innovativeness and competence are mutually supportive, with both requiring a deep understanding of occupational needs and accompanying skillsets. Competence, as a principle of Mission Command, ensures that innovative concepts are aligned appropriately to improve unit effectiveness. Innovation often demands high levels of expertise to navigate the complexities of new approaches, and the subsequent actions required to integrate proposed solutions into existing frameworks. The ability for an individual to display innovativeness as a behavior is, therefore, both supported and enhanced by a foundation of competence, making this connection crucial for driving mission success.

(2) Innovativeness and Shared Understanding (Nuanced)

While innovativeness can contribute to developing shared understanding among members within an organization, the relationship is influenced by myriad environmental factors within a given group, making the connection less than deliberate, and in some cases, temporarily disruptive. Innovation within an organization enables its members to introduce new ideas to their peers, superiors, and subordinates. To achieve and maintain success, those ideas must be communicated, delivered, and promulgated to all members. As these new methods, products, or ideologies make their way through the existing system, they have the potential to create friction with established policies and procedures. In many cases, this friction can be healthy, reinforcing or sharpening the current shared understanding. Conversely, friction can contribute to the erosion of shared understanding, regardless of the potential benefits of the innovation. Ultimately, the adoption of new ideas, policies, or processes is contingent upon how effectively innovations are integrated and accepted by the collective group to establish and nurture a new shared understanding.

(3) Innovativeness and Commander's Intent (Nuanced)

Innovativeness can deliver new ways to achieve mission objectives, but this relationship requires careful navigation of existing organizational expectations to ensure that proposed creative solutions do not deviate from objectives that align with commander's intent.



(4) Innovativeness and Mission Orders (Nuanced)

Similar to the relationship to commander's intent, innovativeness often involves introducing new approaches to executing previously promulgated orders, which can enhance or complicate their fulfillment. This relationship depends, significantly, on the flexibility of the existing mission orders, making it a less direct connection.

(5) Risk-Taking and Risk Acceptance (Strong)

The willingness to take risks requires members to make decisions that embrace uncertainty. Therefore, we determined that the connection between Miller's (1983) intrapreneurial behavior of risk-taking has a strong connection to risk acceptance in the decision-making process within Mission Command. Furthermore, risk acceptance is integral to structured and ambient risk management procedures within an organization, particularly within a military operational environment. Subordinate leaders must retain skills that enable them to efficiently weigh potential actions against the values and priorities of the organization to achieve mission success. Risk-taking, as an intrapreneurial behavior, has the potential to empower and promote appropriate and effective risk management within the ranks.

(6) Risk-Taking and Mutual Trust (Nuanced)

Risk-taking is facilitated by mutual trust within a team, as it provides the psychological safety required to embrace uncertainty. Trust ensures that when risks are taken, the team is aligned and supportive, making the relationship between the two more nuanced than direct.

(7) Proactiveness and Commander's Intent (Strong)

Although blunt, the relationship between proactiveness and the Mission Command principle of commander's intent is strong. Proactiveness empowers leaders to anticipate future challenges and prepare their teams to execute accordingly. Forward-thinking behavior among subordinate staffs enables them to align their autonomy and associated actions with the overarching mission objectives promulgated through the chain of



command. A proactive approach to executing a given mission objective directly supports adherence to commander's intent.

(8) Proactiveness and Disciplined Initiative (Strong)

Proactiveness also complements disciplined initiative by encouraging individuals to act before challenges escalate. We found that alignment between the two has potential to bolster a team's agility and responsiveness, enabling them to execute decisions with confidence and in harmony with the overall mission plan. The connection between proactiveness and disciplined initiative is essential to delegation within a hierarchal system.



II. ENTREPRENEURSHIP VS. INTRAPRENEURSHIP: SIMILARITIES AND DIFFERENCES

A. INTRODUCTION

This chapter discusses the primary similarities and differences between entrepreneurship and intrapreneurship as concepts, highlighting the use of personal versus organizational resources. Furthermore, by comparing intrinsic and extrinsic motivational factors of entrepreneurs and intrapreneurs, we seek to understand how these roles utilize available resources differently to promote innovation within an ecosystem. The subsequent discussion is framed leveraging perspectives from Gifford Pinchot and Ron Pellman (1999) and Danny Miller (1983), respectively, occasionally supplemented with findings from the 2018 Swedish study done by Pauline Birkemalm and Sandra Jansson. We concluded this chapter by returning to the foundational intrapreneurial behaviors of innovativeness, risktaking, and proactiveness as outlined by Miller.

B. DISTINGUISHING ENTREPRENEURSHIP FROM INTRAPRENEURSHIP

a. Resourcing: Personal Versus Organizational

One of the most significant differences between entrepreneurship and intrapreneurship is the reliance on personal versus organizational resources. Entrepreneurs, by definition, are individuals who start and run their own business ventures, taking on personal financial risks in the hope of profit. This means they must often rely heavily on personal or borrowed resources, investing their own time, money, and social capital to launch and sustain their desired venture.

In contrast, intrapreneurs have the opportunity to operate within the constraints and opportunities of the organization. It is expected that they leverage the organization's resources—such as funding, infrastructure, and organized networks of subject matter experts—to innovate and drive new projects or initiatives. Pinchot and Pellman (1999) define intrapreneurs simply as intra-corporate entrepreneurs that an organization can leverage to stay relevant within a market. Intrapreneurs are typically empowered by



establishing a system within which they can display entrepreneurial behaviors with implicit access to their organization's resources. In theory, this style of operation enables employees displaying these behaviors to focus more on the innovation they seek to manufacture, unimpeded by personal financial obligations that typically burden entrepreneurs. This distinction underscores the fundamental difference in resource utilization between entrepreneurs and intrapreneurs.

b. Entrepreneurial Resource Utilization in Depth

Entrepreneurs must often bootstrap their desired ventures, using personal savings or seeking external investments to fund their projects. The inherent risk of personal financial loss is typically high, necessitating a strategic approach to manage available resources. Miller (1983) emphasizes that entrepreneurship is characterized by proactiveness, innovativeness, and risk-taking—traits that are crucial for navigating the uncertainties of starting a new business. Entrepreneurs, and therefore, intrapreneurs, must be highly resourceful, often working with limited means and finding creative solutions to overcome financial constraints.

Birkemalm and Jansson's 2018 research highlights that, although monetary rewards vary amongst entrepreneurs, most value them as a significant motivator. Said differently, for many entrepreneurs, the potential for high financial returns justifies the substantial personal investment and associated risk involved in the road to success (Birkemalm & Jansson, 2018). Therefore, financial motivation aligns with a common entrepreneurial desire to maximize personal gains from their ventures.

c. Intrapreneurial Resource Utilization in Depth

In contrast, intrapreneurs are provided initial and sustained access to the resources of their parent organization, which can significantly reduce or completely neutralize prospects of personal financial risk typically associated with entrepreneurial activities. Pinchot and Pellman (1999) noted that intrapreneurs can innovate within the safety net of the corporate structure, using company resources to develop new products or services. This setup allows intrapreneurs to focus on innovation and creativity without the immediate pressure of raising capital. Birkemalm and Jansson (2018) found that intrapreneurs are



more motivated by challenges and the opportunity to innovate within their roles vice monetary rewards. This intrinsic motivation is supported by access to organizational resources that enable them to experiment and take calculated risks free from the typical burdens of entrepreneurial ventures.

C. MOTIVATIONAL FACTORS: ENTREPRENEURS VERSUS INTRAPRENEURS

1. Extrinsic Motivational Factors

Extrinsic motivational factors are external rewards or incentives that drive individuals to perform certain tasks. For entrepreneurs, monetary rewards are a significant extrinsic motivator. Birkemalm and Jansson's 2018 research found that the potential for substantial financial gain is a primary driver for many entrepreneurs, that many were willing to take on high levels of personal risk in pursuit of profit. The projected success of their ventures directly influences their financial well-being, making extrinsic rewards a crucial element of entrepreneurial motivation.

Their intrapreneurial counterparts are typically less motivated by explicit monetary rewards and more so by recognition and opportunities provided by their parent organization, such as promotion. Pinchot and Pellman (1999) highlighted that, to truly unlock the potential of innovation driven by intrapreneurs a proper organizational climate must be set that, among many factors, must encourage risk, communicate and connect them to the strategic vision of the company, and enable them to contribute effectively. A support system with the former attributes is necessary to empower hopeful intrapreneurs to seek opportunities to improve products and processes within an organization with faith that they will be acknowledged for their contributions. Birkemalm and Jansson (2018) corroborate this idea, noting that intrapreneurs are driven by the challenge of their work and the opportunity to make a meaningful impact within the organization.

2. Intrinsic Motivational Factors

Intrinsic motivational factors are internal influences that inspire individuals to engage in activities typically founded in their personal value vice in response to external



forces. For entrepreneurs and intrapreneurs alike, intrinsic motivation plays a significant role, but the nature of this motivation differs between respective parties.

Entrepreneurs are often driven by a desire for independence and autonomy over their work. Miller emphasized that the ability for an entrepreneur to shape their own destiny and make strategic decisions independently is a powerful intrinsic motivator (Miller, 1983). This yearning for autonomy is a hallmark of entrepreneurial behavior, as entrepreneurs value the freedom to pursue their vision free from undesirable external constraints.

Intrapreneurs, in contrast, typically find intrinsic motivation in the opportunity to innovate and contribute to an organization or group's collective success. Pinchot and Pellman (1999) mentioned that the ability to develop new ideas and see them implemented within the company's framework provides a sense of accomplishment and professional fulfillment keeping them in high demand for future endeavors. (Pinchot & Pellman, 1999). Birkemalm and Jansson (2018) noted that intrapreneurs are particularly motivated by the challenge of their work and the potential to drive organizational process improvement.

3. Completing the Comparison: Returning to Miller's Elements

Miller (1983) identified three core elements of entrepreneurial behavior: innovativeness, risk-taking, and proactiveness. These elements are essential for understanding the fundamental nature of entrepreneurship and intrapreneurship.

a. Innovativeness

Innovation is at the heart of both entrepreneurship and intrapreneurship. Entrepreneurs innovate to create new products or services in an open market, while intrapreneurs innovate to enhance existing processes or develop new business lines within existing organizations.

b. Risk-Taking

While the nature of risk-taking differs between the two roles, it remains a shared core element. Entrepreneurs take on personal financial risks, while intrapreneurs take on professional risks, such as the potential for failure of their projects within their corporate



environment and the prospect that failure may have an impact on their professional reputation and/or career progression.

c. Proactiveness

Entrepreneurs must be proactive, anticipating market needs and acting decisively to capitalize on opportunities. This trait is equally important for intrapreneurs, who must proactively seek out ways to innovate within their organizations and drive projects forward, ensuring they consider the boundaries, constraints, priorities, and vulnerabilities of their organization to emerging opportunities and threats within the market.

By examining these three elements in the context of personal versus organizational resources, we can observe how both entrepreneurs and intrapreneurs contribute to innovation and growth. Entrepreneurs leverage personal resources to build new ventures from the ground up, while intrapreneurs utilize organizational resources to drive innovation within established organizations. Both roles are vital for product and process innovation and organizational success. Understanding the distinct needs, vulnerabilities, and motivators of intrapreneurs can help the Navy build its innovation and organizational success.



THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK


III. STRATEGIC LINKAGES: MISSION COMMAND, JOINT DEVELOPMENT, AND INTRAPRENEURIAL BEHAVIORS

A. INTRODUCTION

Our mapping of the principles between Mission Command and principles of intrapreneurship is crucial for exploring ways to better develop future Navy leaders aligned within joint expectations. By examining the six elements of Mission Command as stated in *ADP 6–0 Mission Command: Command and Control of Army Forces* (Department of the Army, 2019)—Competence, Mutual Trust, Shared Understanding, Commander's Intent, Disciplined Initiative, and Risk Acceptance—alongside Miller's principles (1983) of intrapreneurship—innovativeness, risk-taking, and proactiveness (Miller, 1983)—within the construct of key joint doctrine, this section illustrates how each respective set of principles can be integrated to bolster the professional skills of JOs in the DON.

B. THE ORIGINS AND PRINCIPLES OF MISSION COMMAND

Retired Army Colonels Sharpe and Creviston wrote an article (2015) discussing the concept of Mission Command, specifically its roots in early 19th-century Prussian military doctrine. They emphasized that Mission Command was particularly influenced by the ideas of Gerhard von Scharnhorst, August von Gneisenau, and Carl von Clausewitz. The initial development of Mission Command as doctrine was driven by the need for a more flexible and adaptive approach to command and control, enabling the deployment of forces within the highly dynamic battlefields environments of the time. Scharnhorst and Gneisenau emphasized the importance of empowering subordinate leaders with the authority to make autonomous decisions within the constraints of overall mission priorities and objectives, thus enhancing the Army's responsiveness and effectiveness.

The foundation of Mission Command is decentralized decision-making, which provides space for subordinate leaders to exercise their autonomy in execution of operations within their purview. This approach hinges upon the trust commanders place in their subordinates, who are then expected to translate that trust into action, presumably in the best interests of their respective mission objectives and while maintaining compliance



Acquisition Research Program Department of Defense Management Naval Postgraduate School to the constraints of the overarching commander's intent. Clausewitz's writings further underscored the significance of understanding commander's intent, as it provides the necessary framework within which subordinates may be required to operate independently.

War is more than a true chameleon that slightly adapts its characteristics to the given case. As the total phenomenon it's dominant tendencies always make war a remarkable Trinity - composed of primordial violence, hatred and enmity, which are to be regarded as a blind natural force; of the play of chance and probability within which the creative spirit is free to roam; and of its element of subordination, as an instrument of policy, which makes it subject to reason alone. (Clausewitz, 1989, p. 89)

The core tenets of Mission Command include building cohesive teams through mutual trust, creating shared understanding, providing clear commander's intent, exercising disciplined initiative, using mission orders, and accepting prudent risk. Building cohesive teams and fostering mutual trust are essential for creating an environment where subordinates feel confident in making decisions and taking initiative.

Creating shared understanding ensures that all members of the team have a common perception of the mission objectives and the operational environment. Providing commander's intent clearly allows subordinates to align their actions with the overall goals, even in the absence of direct orders. Exercising disciplined initiative involves encouraging subordinates to take proactive steps and make decisions that contribute to comprehensive mission success while staying within the boundaries of commander's intent. Using mission orders, rather than detailed directives, gives subordinates the flexibility to adapt to changing circumstances at the tactical or operational levels and seize opportunities as they arise. Accepting prudent risk acknowledges that uncertainty and hazard are inherent in military operations. Furthermore, commanders must be willing to make calculated decisions that balance potential gains against possible losses.

Mission Command's principles have been integral to the evolution of modern military strategies, and its emphasis on trust, initiative, and decentralized decision-making continues to influence contemporary military doctrines. Understanding and implementing these principles is crucial for developing effective and adaptive leaders capable of operating in complex and unpredictable environments.



C. THE ARMY'S RE-EMPHASIS ON MISSION COMMAND

In the early 2010s, the U.S. Army initiated a campaign to explicitly re-emphasize Mission Command principles within its culture and doctrine, recognizing their potential to enhance operational effectiveness in complex and rapidly changing warfighting environments. Despite this renewed focus, the Army has faced significant challenges in fully adopting these principles. In a 2019 article by Patricia Kime noted that many young Army leaders were hesitant to embrace Mission Command due to a lack of trust and fear of making mistakes. (Military.com, 2019).

Kime stated that chief among the hurdles to re-establishing a healthy Mission Command climate is the Army's historical "zero tolerance" mentality for mistakes, contributing to risk aversion among JOs in particular. The 2019 article highlighted that the adoption of Mission Command requires not only doctrinal change but also a cultural shift towards trust and empowerment. Trust enables subordinates to take disciplined initiative and make decisions that align with commander's intent that do not require constant oversight. The lack of trust among junior leaders combined with fear of retribution for operational mistakes are significant barriers to the successful implementation of Mission Command.

Several intrinsic and extrinsic motivators influence the adoption of Mission Command principles among JOs. Intrinsic motivators, such as personal growth, job satisfaction, and a sense of accomplishment, are crucial for fostering a culture of innovation and proactive behavior. Conversely, extrinsic motivators, such as recognition and rewards also have potential to impact JOs' willingness to embrace these principles. The lack of intrinsic motivation—driven by a culture of fear and risk aversion—undermines the potential for extrinsic motivators that enable Mission Command to take root effectively.

Similar to the Army, there are recommendations within the Navy to review Mission Command elements within its administrative and operational structures. An initiative like this would have potential to adjust Navy ideologies to better match the demands of emerging adversarial capabilities, leveraging lessons learned from the Army's efforts. According to Kime, the Navy recognizes the need for more decentralized decision-making



and the empowerment of junior leaders to enhance operational readiness in dynamic environments.

D. PREFACING JOINT DOCTRINE REVIEW: MISSION COMMAND AND MILLER'S PRINCIPLES OF INTRAPRENEURSHIP

Prior to reviewing joint doctrine, it is important to recount discussions from Chapter I. The relationship between Mission Command and Miller's (1983) principles of intrapreneurship—innovativeness, risk-taking, and proactiveness—are highly relevant in the context of Mission Command. Encouraging these behaviors among JOs can foster a culture of trust and initiative, essential for successful implementation of Mission Command within the Navy's organizational culture.

Innovativeness involves seeking new solutions and approaches, which aligns with the need for independent decision-making in Mission Command. Risk-taking, when appropriately supported by a culture of trust, affords JOs a better opportunity to leverage their delegated autonomy to make bold decisions without fear of undue retribution. Proactiveness ensures that JOs are not merely reactive in their assessment of operational elements but are actively seeking ways to contribute to mission success using authorized corrective actions.

Furthermore, promoting intrapreneurial behaviors among JOs can constructively reinforce key intrinsic motivators—such as fostering a sense of ownership, competence, and relatedness. Restated, Miller's (1983) principles have the propensity to enhance JOs' internal drive to engage with Mission Command principles. This in turn, has the potential to positively influence extrinsic motivators, such as recognition and trust in the Mission Command structure. When JOs feel intrinsically motivated and supported by a culture founded in hierarchal trust, their commitment to Mission Command principles is likely to strengthen, leading to improved operational and organizational outcomes.



E. REVIEW OF JOINT DOCTRINE

1. Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff Instruction 1800.01G - Officer Professional Military Education Policy

The Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff (2024) Instruction (CJCSI) 1800.01G, also known as the Officer Professional Military Education Policy (OPMEP), provides comprehensive policies and guidelines for the development and implementation of PME programs across all service branches. The primary purpose of the OPMEP is to ensure a coherent and standardized approach to officer education, aligning it with the needs of the Joint Force. The OPMEP outlines Desired Leadership Attributes (DLA) that Joint Professional Military Education (JPME) programs must aim to imbue in officers as they promote within the DoD (Joint Chiefs of Staff, 2024).

Via promotion of DLAs, we found that the OPMEP structure is well suited to set conditions for DoD officers to embody both the principles of Mission Command and the characteristics of intrapreneurship, fostering a culture of innovation and readiness within the Navy (Joint Chiefs of Staff, 2024). The following DLAs define the characteristics of desired leaders:

- (1) Understand the Security Environment and the Contributions of All Instruments of National Power: This aligns with the competence and innovativeness elements, emphasizing the need for strategic thinking and integration of diverse capabilities to achieve national objectives.
- (2) Anticipate and Respond to Surprise and Uncertainty: This requirement supports the disciplined initiative and innovativeness elements, highlighting the importance of flexibility and proactive adaptation in the face of unexpected challenges.
- (3) Anticipate and Recognize Change and Lead Transitions: This aligns with mutual trust, shared understanding, and the proactiveness principle of intrapreneurship, which involves anticipating future opportunities and challenges and acting decisively.
- (4) **Operate on Intent Through Trust, Empowerment, and Understanding:** This principle supports mutual trust and risk management and aligns with



shared understanding, fostering an environment where subordinates are empowered to take initiative within the commander's intent.

- (5) Make Ethical Decisions Based on the Shared Values of the Profession of Arms: This principle supports mutual trust and risk management, ensuring decisions are made with integrity and accountability.
- (6) Think Critically and Strategically in Applying Joint Warfighting Principles and Concepts to Joint Operations: This principle supports innovativeness and competence, emphasizing the need for ongoing education and skill development.

The OPMEP DLAs ultimately serve as a foundation for shaping Joint Learning Outcomes (JLOs). JLOs are designed to guide the educational objectives and competencies officers must achieve through JPME programs within their respective service components. These outcomes have been published to ensure military education is aligned properly to meet strategic objective of the Joint Force, emphasizing the need to prepare officers to excel in joint, interagency, intergovernmental, and multinational environments. By embedding attributes such as strategic thinking, adaptability, ethical decision-making, effective communication, and continuous learning into JLOs, the OPMEP aims to develop well-rounded officers capable of navigating the complexities of modern military operations.

Joint DLAs may promote qualities in JOs that are conducive to fostering intrapreneurial behaviors. Therefore, officers trained under these guidelines may be more likely to innovate by understanding the broader security environment and anticipating changes, take risks by exercising disciplined initiative and risk management, and act proactively by anticipating needs and driving forward-thinking initiatives.

Furthermore, promoting intrapreneurial behaviors may reinforce the OPMEP DLAs. Encouraging officers to be innovative, take risks, and act proactively may align with the DLAs' focus on strategic thinking, adaptability, and proactive leadership. As officers engage in intrapreneurial activities, they may further develop these attributes, enhancing their overall effectiveness as leaders. Observing the similarities between DLAs and intrapreneurial behaviors highlights the potential to bolster the Navy's innovation and modernization ecosystems, improving operational readiness and strategic advantage.



2. Mapping Intrapreneurial Behaviors with Joint DLA Expectations

As in Chapter I, the relationships between intrapreneurial behaviors and the joint DLAs are represented by solid-colored lines and red dotted lines. The solid lines in Figure 2 indicate superior, direct connections that have a significant impact on leadership qualities needed for successful joint operations, while the red dotted lines represent lesser, more nuanced and context-dependent relationships.



Figure 2. Mapping Intrapreneurial Behaviors with Joint Desired Leader Attributes. Source: (Joint Chiefs of Staff, 2024; Miller 1983)

(1) Innovativeness and Understanding the Security Environment (Superior)

Innovativeness encourages the exploration of new perspectives and solutions to emerging threats, making it a strong supporter of joint DLA #1. Furthermore, it underscores the importance of creativity and forward-thinking in analyzing and responding to complex security challenges. By fostering innovation, leaders can better anticipate and navigate



evolving landscapes, ensuring that their strategies are informed by a deep understanding of the warfighting environment.

(2) Innovativeness and Responding to Surprise and Uncertainty (Superior)

The ability to innovate also has a strong relationship with an individual's ability to adapt to surprise and uncertainty, as it enables them to develop creative solutions under pressure, maintaining operational effectiveness. Furthermore, innovativeness empowers leaders to think outside the box, empowering them to mitigate unexpected situations by converting their circumstances into opportunities for growth and success.

(3) Innovativeness and Recognizing Change and Leading Transitions (Superior)

Innovativeness plays an important role in recognizing and leading transitions, providing the tools and encouragement for the mindset needed to navigate change effectively. By leading with an innovative attitude, leaders can drive success through challenging transitions while keeping teams aligned to mission objectives as they evolve.

(4) Risk-Taking and Operating on Intent Through Trust and Empowerment (Lesser)

The ability to operate on intent through trust and empowerment is indirectly supported by a leader's willingness to take calculated and acceptable risks. When established appropriately, risk-taking behavior has the potential to enhance trust within a team by demonstrating and demanding confidence and support.

(5) Risk-Taking and Making Ethical Decisions Based on Shared Values (Lesser)

Risk-taking can push boundaries and drive significant achievements, but it must be done in alignment with ethically decisions that resonate with those shared within the organization. Leaders who can balance these factors effectively can drive their organizations and their subordinate commanders to achieve high-impact results. However, this relationship is more supportive than direct, as it requires careful judgment and a strong understanding of the ethical foundation.



(6) Proactiveness and Recognizing Change and Leading Transitions (Superior)

Proactiveness is directly linked to the ability to recognize change and lead transitions by empowering subordinate leaders to anticipate future shifts and prepare their units to take adaptive actions. Leaders who exhibit proactive behavior are better equipped to navigate transitions smoothly.

(7) Proactiveness and Responding to Surprise and Uncertainty (Lesser)

Proactiveness also supports the ability to respond to surprise and uncertainty but is dependent on applicability within the environment. While being proactive generally involves anticipating challenges before they arise, the specific nature of surprises can vary, making this connection less direct. Proactive leaders preparing for a range of potential scenarios can respond more effectively when the less likely or desired events come to fruition, but there are many other factors at play in uncertain situations, making the connection inconsistent.

3. Linking Mission Command and Joint Desired Leader Attributes Through Intrapreneurial Behaviors

Building on Figures 1 and 2, the interrelatedness of Mission Command elements, Miller's (1983) intrapreneurial behaviors, and joint doctrine's DLAs can be effectively showcased through a side-by-side comparison in Figure 3.





Figure 3. Linking Mission Command and Joint Desired Leader Attributes through Intrapreneurial Behaviors. Source: (Joint Chiefs of Staff, 2024; Miller, 1983; U.S. Department of the Army, 2019)

Figure 3 shows us that integration between Mission Command principles and Joint DLAs can clearly be achieved by leveraging Miller's (1983) intrapreneurial behaviors as a common denominator. Miller's elements of innovativeness, risk-taking, and proactiveness naturally bridge gaps between the respective structural concepts, establishing a baseline for more comprehensive framework.

By fostering these behaviors, the DON can enhance both its operational capabilities and the leadership development of its JOs, ensuring that Mission Command and leadership attributes are implemented and mutually reinforced. This integrated approach not only has the capacity to strengthen mission execution but may also provide opportunities to better prepare JOs to excel in increasingly complex and dynamic environments.

4. Historical Example: Admiral Horatio Nelson

Admiral Horatio Nelson's leadership during the Battle of Trafalgar exemplifies the principles of both Mission Command and displays enabling qualities of intrapreneurship. Analyzing Nelson's actions through this dual framework while incorporating joint doctrine's DLAs, provides a practical opportunity to observe and understand their interrelatedness.



a. Competence and Innovativeness

Nelson's extensive naval experience and tactical acumen were unmatched, reflecting his competence as a strategic thinker and warfighter. His innovative tactics at Trafalgar, such as the use of unconventional attack formations, demonstrate his ability to generate new ideas and solutions under pressure, aligning with strategic-mindedness and innovativeness.

b. Mutual Trust and Risk-Taking

Nelson cultivated a strong bond of trust with his subordinates, exemplified by his famous signal, "England expects that every man will do his duty." This trust allowed his officers to take risks and make bold decisions in the heat of battle without fear of negative repercussions, emphasizing the importance of effective communication and risk-taking.

c. Shared Understanding and Proactiveness

Nelson ensured that his subordinate officers understood his strategies and the broader objectives of their missions, fostering a shared understanding of the commander's intent. His proactive approach in anticipating the enemy's movements and adapting his tactics accordingly highlights his forward-thinking and initiative, aligning with the conditions he set to enable strategic integration and proactiveness among his leadership cadre.

d. Commander's Intent and Proactiveness

Nelson's clear guidance of the desired end state enabled his subordinates to align their autonomy with the overarching mission objectives. Furthermore, his proactive approach in shaping the battlefield to his advantage demonstrated his ability to anticipate and act on future opportunities, underscoring the importance of strategic adaptation and proactiveness.

e. Disciplined Initiative and Innovativeness

Nelson encouraged his captains to use their judgment and take initiative, fostering a flexible and responsive command structure. His willingness to experiment with new



approaches underscored the disciplined initiatives he often took and set the example for others to take at their discretion, aligning appropriately with the general tenets of innovative leadership and innovativeness as an element of intrapreneurship.

f. Risk Acceptance and Risk-Taking

Nelson was willing to take bold risks to achieve decisive victories, highlighted by his unconventional tactics at Trafalgar and the accompanied trust he placed in his subordinate commanders. His acceptance of potential failure as part of the innovation process highlights the importance of balancing risk and reward in decision-making and emphasizes the need for adaptation and risk acceptance.



IV. INNOVATION IN THE NAVY: CURRENT STATUS, CHALLENGES, AND PATH FORWARD

A. INTRODUCTION

This chapter delves into the state of innovation within the USN, highlighting shortfalls that hinder effective innovation. Our discussion leverages insights from the Defense Innovation Board (DIB) report (2024) to outline these challenges. Additionally, the chapter explores how the Navy's Talent Management Center of Excellence (TMCoE) and Get Real Get Better (GRGB) programs are attempting to address these issues to foster a more innovative culture.

B. SHORTFALLS IN INNOVATION

The 2024 DIB report identifies several systemic challenges obstructing innovation within the DoD and the Navy. The key issues highlighted include risk aversion, lack of top cover, misaligned rewards, and insufficient career pathways for innovators.

(1) Avoiding Risk, Perpetuating Complacency, and Preventing Speed

The prevailing culture within the DoD, including the Navy, often avoids calculated risks, which stifles proactive innovation and slows down the adoption of new technologies. This risk-averse mentality perpetuates complacency and hinders speed, both of which are crucial for maintaining technological superiority.

(2) Lacking Top Cover, Underleveraging the Frozen Middle, and Rewarding the Status Quo

Without bold leadership to provides top cover to innovators, middle management tends to promote status quo behaviors in self-preservation. Lack of support and recognition for innovative efforts perpetuates a culture where mediocrity tends to be rewarded, and groundbreaking ideas are often stifled unintentionally.



(3) Lacking Innovation Career Pathways and Mismanaging Talent

The Navy and the broader DoD enterprise have not effectively established career pathways that promote and reward innovative behaviors explicitly. Mismanagement of talent, combined with an outdated career progression system, unintentionally discourages individuals from pursuing innovative projects and leads to a high attrition rate among those with the most potential to drive organizational change. Specifically, the Navy's performance evaluation system has not been significantly updated or modified since 1996.

(4) Minimal Understanding of How Industry Works

The DON has not prioritized level-setting communication between its industry partners, creating a deep chasm in operational expectations. Furthermore, the consolidation of the defense industry into a small number of primes exacerbates the often-convoluted nature of defense language. Essentially, the DON is ineffective in its ability to synthesize and communicate customer needs, making its industry partners increasingly less incentivized to negotiate efficiently due to lack of competition.

(5) Detaching Innovation from the Mission and Flying Blind

There is a significant disconnect between innovation efforts and warfighter requirements, pertaining to both quality of life and quality of service, resulting in disjointed enterprise efforts that fail to deliver timely and relevant technological solutions to the field.

C. CONNECTING INNOVATION SHORTFALLS TO MISSION COMMAND PRINCIPLES

Considering the outlined challenges from the DIB, they may be better understood through the application of Mission Command Principles.

(1) Risk Acceptance

One of the key issues identified was the Navy's cultural aversion to risk, which directly contrasts with the Mission Command principle of risk acceptance. Effective risk management is crucial for fostering a culture of innovation, where new ideas can be tested



and developed without the fear of failure. The current risk-averse culture within the Navy hampers the ability to innovate and/or adopt new technologies and methodologies.

(2) Disciplined Initiative

The lack of top cover and support for innovators persistently undermines the principle of disciplined initiative. Innovators need the freedom to explore new ideas and take actions that align with broader strategic goals. However, without adequate support from leadership, individuals are less likely to take the initiative, resulting in a culture of stagnation and a failure to capitalize on potential opportunities for improvement.

(3) Mutual Trust

Preservation of the status quo and lack of recognition for innovative efforts erodes mutual trust. When innovators are neither supported or recognized, it creates an environment of distrust, where subordinate leaders are hesitant to propose or pursue new ideas. Building mutual trust involves recognizing and rewarding innovative efforts, ensuring that individuals feel valued and supported in their endeavors.

D. CONNECTING INNOVATION SHORTFALLS TO MILLER'S INTRAPRENEURIAL BEHAVIORS

Considering the outlined challenges from the DIB, they may be better understood through the application of Miller's (1983) intrapreneurial behaviors.

(1) Innovativeness

Miller's (1983) principle of innovativeness is about generating new ideas and solutions. The shortfalls in risk acceptance within the Navy stifle the promotion and sustainment of this behavior, as individual members are generally discouraged from pursuing innovative projects due to the fear of failure and lack of support. For innovation to thrive the Navy must foster a culture that encourages experimentation and values creativity.



(2) Risk-Taking

The current culture of risk aversion within the Navy directly impedes the ability to take calculated risks. Innovators need to feel empowered to take risks without the fear of punitive consequences. By embracing risk-taking, the Navy can drive forward new ideas and technologies that are essential for maintaining its competitive edge.

(3) Proactiveness

Proactiveness involves anticipating and acting on future opportunities. The lack of career pathways and support for innovators impedes this behavior from being acted upon, as individuals are not incentivized to be proactive in their roles. Creating clear career pathways and providing support for innovation can encourage individuals to take proactive steps in developing new solutions that align with the Navy's strategic goals.

E. ADDRESSING INNOVATION CHALLENGES: THE NAVY'S TALENT MANAGEMENT CENTER OF EXCELLENCE

The Navy's TMCoE is actively working to address these innovation challenges by implementing several initiatives aimed at fostering a more innovative culture. The TMCoE focuses on talent management, performance evaluation, and leadership development to create an environment conducive to innovation. Key initiatives include:

(1) Talent Management and Development

The TMCoE is committed to identifying and nurturing talent within the Navy. Through initiatives such as the Navy Leader Development Framework (NLDF) and the Navy Learning and Development Strategy (NLDS), the TMCoE aims to create clear career pathways for innovators, providing opportunities for continuous learning and professional growth (MyNavy HR, n.d.a.).

(2) Performance Evaluation and Feedback

The TMCoE is making efforts to enhance the Navy's performance evaluation process to better recognize and reward desired behaviors and professional achievements. Modifications to existing interfaces for conducting evaluations and FITREPS such as the



eNAVFIT system, are expected to provide more comprehensive feedback and evaluations from a member's chain of command (CoC), striving to ensure that individuals who contribute to the organization and perform their duties are acknowledged and rewarded (MyNavy HR, n.d.d.). As these modifications are released, updates to the Navy's PES are available on a public facing website to help service members manage expectations.

(3) Coaching and Mentorship

To support the development of the Navy's current and future leaders, the TMCoE is continually refining a series of coaching and mentorship programs. These programs connect members with experienced mentors who can provide guidance and support in navigating the challenges of driving innovation within the Navy (MyNavy HR, n.d.b).

(4) Navy Leadership Assessment Program

The Navy Leadership Assessment Program (NLAP) aims to assess and develop leadership capabilities across the Navy. By focusing on the qualities necessary for effective leadership and innovation, the NLAP helps ensure that future leaders are equipped to foster a culture of innovation and drive the Navy's mission forward (MyNavy HR, n.d.c.).

By addressing the identified challenges and implementing these initiatives, the Navy has developed a foundation to build an environment where Miller's (1983) intrapreneurial behaviors are fully realized. The three key elements of intrapreneurship— innovativeness, risk-taking, and proactiveness—are essential for driving innovation within the Navy. By fostering a culture that embraces these behaviors, supported by effective talent management and leadership development, the Navy can overcome its innovation shortfalls and maintain its technological edge.

F. SETTING THE CONDITIONS: LEVERAGING THE NAVY'S GET REAL GET BETTER CAMPAIGN

The Navy's Get Real Get Better (GRGB) campaign, launched in 2021 under the leadership of former Chief of Naval Operations Admiral Michael Gilday, was designed to catalyze a Navy-wide shift in culture aimed at fostering continuous learning, improvement, and adaptability. Gilday emphasized that "the essential element is fostering an



ecosystem—a culture—that assesses, corrects, and innovates better than the opposition" (Department of Navy, n.d.). GRGB initiated a comprehensive effort to reset and enhance the mindset of both leadership and subordinates, ensuring the entire organization can evolve at the pace necessary to maintain its warfighting edge.

Aside from bolstering quality of life and quality of service experiences of its servicemembers, GRGB is a pivotal step forward in shaping the Navy's efforts to foster a culture of innovation and continuous improvement. The sheer size, scale and complexity of the DON necessitates a unified approach that not only aligns its operations but also reorients the mindset of its personnel and partners. GRGB addresses this need by promoting an ecosystem that encourages rigorous self-assessment, embraces constructive feedback, and prioritizes iterative problem-solving. Behaviors like these are essential in setting the conditions for the Navy to overcome systemic barriers to innovation like those identified in the Defense Innovation Board (DIB) report—most notably, risk aversion, complacency, and misaligned organizational incentives.

What distinguishes GRGB from previous enterprise shaping attempts within the DON is its focus on cultural renovation. Rather than confining outreach to isolated programs or initiatives, GRGB tools and values are being deployed at all echelons throughout the Navy, ensuring that both leadership and subordinates engage in a collective effort to "get real" about their performance, capabilities, and challenges. GRGB empowers service members to redefine how they measure success—moving beyond superficial metrics to focus on deep, meaningful improvement across the organization. This is crucial for a military force as large as the Navy, where the scale of operations can often obscure underlying inefficiencies or disincentives for innovation. By setting a clear expectation that leaders must actively identify gaps and seek realistic, actionable, and sustainable solutions, GRGB ensures that the appropriate conditions are set for innovation to thrive and sustain.

Continuing the focus on sustainment, GRGB's emphasis on adaptability and selfcorrection ensures that the Navy is proactively engaged in modernization and reform. These tenets are key elements in establishing a foundation for the Navy's Talent Management Center of Excellence (TMCoE) to thrive. By creating an environment where talent is nurtured, and individuals are encouraged to take ownership of their roles in driving



progress, GRGB policies directly empower TMCoE initiatives—such as career pathway development and leadership coaching—to take hold and persist.

Furthermore, GRGB provides a fertile foundation for Miller's (1983) intrapreneurial behaviors—innovativeness, risk-taking, and proactiveness—to flourish. The campaign addresses the core cultural issues that have historically stifled innovation within the Navy. Through its deliberate focus on fostering a culture of trust, accountability, and continuous learning, GRGB lays the groundwork for a more empowered workforce with the power and motivation to act as intrapreneurs within the organization. By reframing institutional ideologies and aligning leadership with a shared vision of continuous improvement, it creates an environment where individuals are not only allowed but encouraged to challenge the status quo, propose bold solutions, and take calculated risks—all critical behaviors in overcoming the inertia that hinders innovation in large institutions.



THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK



V. IDENTIFYING ENABLERS OF INTRAPRENEURSHIP WITHIN THE NAVAL ENTERPRISE

Throughout this study, we have mapped Miller's (1983) behaviors of intrapreneurship—innovativeness, risk-taking, and proactiveness—onto the foundational elements of Mission Command and the joint DLAs. By doing so, we have established a clear framework for understanding how these principles can be operationalized within the unique context of naval operations.

Here, we shift from theory to practice, offering tangible focus areas that have potential to foster intrapreneurial behaviors and, in turn, enhance operational readiness and retention within the Navy. This chapter introduces specific tools and strategies—such as the Prototype Knowledge Assessment Tool (PKAT) and performance evaluation systems—designed to bridge the gap between strategic intent and on-the-ground implementation.

By enabling JOs to better understand their organization, incentivizing calculated risk-taking, and building a culture of trust, these enablers provide a concrete pathway for the Navy to nurture a new generation of leaders who are not only innovative but also deeply aligned with the Navy's mission and values. Through these efforts, we intend to lay the groundwork for a more resilient and adaptive Navy, capable of thriving in an increasingly complex global environment.

A. ENABLING INNOVATIVENESS THROUGH ORGANIZATIONAL UNDERSTANDING

Our research has shown that to effectively foster innovativeness within the Navy, there must be clear and accessible performance indicators level-set to the needs of our most junior of officers. Organizational understanding emerged as a critical enabler in this context. For JOs to enhance their innovativeness, they must first grasp the intricacies of the Navy as an overarching entity—its structure, culture, and mission, as well as the compartmentalized responsibilities of their respective occupational communities and the occupational communities adjacent to them.



Acquisition Research Program Department of Defense Management Naval Postgraduate School A foundational understanding would enable them to better identify gaps, inefficiencies, and opportunities for improvement. Without organizational clarity, it becomes challenging for JOs to contribute meaningfully towards innovative efforts, and the potential for enterprise-wide effectiveness diminishes. The latter insights led us to develop the Prototype Knowledge Assessment Tool (PKAT), specifically designed to assess and enhance organizational understanding among JOs, ensuring they are equipped to drive innovation from the ground up.

Recalling discussions in Chapters I and III, the Mission Command principle of competence underscores the necessity for individuals within an organization to possess a thorough understanding of their roles and the broader objectives of their organization. Competence, as outlined in ADP 6–0, is not solely about tactical proficiency but also involves the ability to make informed decisions that align with the organization's strategic goals (ADP 6–0, 2019).

In the context of innovativeness, organizational understanding enables individuals to identify and take action to maximize opportunities for innovation that are both technically sound and strategically aligned with the mission. JOs who can effectively comprehend the intricacies of their command structure are better equipped to generate constructive recommendations that advance the organization's goals. Deep organizational insight fosters a culture of innovation, where informed perspectives guide innovative efforts, ensuring they contribute effectively to the organization's mission (ADP 6–0, 2019).

Furthermore, the July 2024 DIB report highlights a significant gap in DoD innovation ecosystem: the lack of "people innovation readiness metrics." This concept refers to the absence of systematic metrics to assess the readiness of individuals within the organization that enable engagement in innovative activities. The DIB report argues that without such metrics, it is challenging to ensure that personnel at all levels, particularly junior members, are equipped with the necessary knowledge and skills to effectively contribute to innovation efforts (DIB, 2024).

The DIB report emphasizes that innovation readiness is not merely about fostering creativity or technical prowess; it involves a comprehensive understanding of the



organizational environment, including strategic objectives, operational challenges, and how individual efforts align with broader mission goals. The report critiques the current state of innovation within the DoD, noting that the absence of these metrics leads to a misalignment between individual innovation efforts and the organization's strategic needs, ultimately resulting in inefficient use of resources and missed opportunities for significant advancements (DIB, 2024).

The insights from the DIB discussed the crucial need for the Navy to develop tools that assess both individual and collective organizational understanding as a precursor to fostering innovation and intrapreneurial behaviors. Our research identified this gap as a primary obstacle to enhancing innovativeness within the JO cadre. In response, we developed the PKAT, to address the lack of "people innovation readiness metrics" by assessing the current level of organizational understanding among JOs.

The PKAT serves as a foundational tool to identify knowledge gaps and assess the readiness of JOs to engage in innovation form within their command environment, to the greater naval enterprise if desired or requested. By systematically evaluating their understanding of organizational architectures and their alignment with the Navy's strategic goals, the PKAT enables the Navy to develop targeted training, education, and facilitation resources. These resources will be essential for enhancing the innovative capacity of JOs, ensuring that their contributions are not only applicable but also strategically aligned with the organization's mission.

The overarching development of the PKAT is fundamentally aligned to address concerns expressed in the DIB's recommendations. Even in its infancy, it shows promise to assist the Navy in cultivating a cadre of JOs that are both knowledgeable and prepared to drive meaningful innovation. For more detailed information about the PKAT and to review the tool itself, refer to Appendix A.

1. PKAT Design Methodology

The development of the PKAT was undertaken by two members of the thesis team through a series of structured sessions. These sessions, held semi-weekly and lasting one to two hours, facilitated the incremental addition of five to ten questions until



approximately 40 questions were formulated in the initial question bank. The foundation for these questions was derived from the Innovation Climate Questionnaire by Gifford Pinchot and Ron Pellman (1999) which provided a proven framework for assessing innovation capacity within organizational environments. The PKAT was designed specifically to evaluate a JO's capacity for innovation within their command context.

To maintain objectivity and mitigate bias, the first PKAT product was conducted in isolation from other team members, advisors, and stakeholders that have prior experience in survey development. This isolation allowed the PKAT producers to craft a tool that was uninfluenced by external expertise, providing a raw assessment of a JO's ability to develop peer assessment tools based solely on their occupational experience. This approach not only ensured the originality of the PKAT but also laid the groundwork for its future refinement and enhancement.

Each session focused on revising the questions for clarity, format, and intention, while also incorporating new questions that emerged during discussions. The initial draft, consisting of 61 questions, was subjected to a preliminary review process, which involved feedback from a lead thesis advisor and a preliminary review by a designated team member without formal training in survey generation. This iterative process, coupled with input from the Navy Survey Program Office, culminated in a refined version of the PKAT comprising 70 questions. This refinement process ensured that the PKAT would be both effective and practical for future applications within the Navy.

PKAT development was informed by a range of assessment and learning resources, including AI-based learning approaches and an innovation leadership course offered at the Naval Postgraduate School. These resources were researched and integrated with the future implementation of the tool in mind, aiming to address gaps in organizational understanding and innovation readiness within the Navy. Further details on PKAT design methodology can be found in Appendix A.

2. PKAT Analysis of Alternatives

To diversify PKAT development we conducted a comprehensive analysis of alternatives (AoA), a methodology frequently employed within the DoD to evaluate and



compare potential solutions in complex scenarios, particularly in weapon systems development. This process was vital in ensuring that the PKAT not only addressed identified gaps in innovation readiness but also aligned with the broader strategic objectives of the Navy.

During the AoA, various existing tools and frameworks were examined to determine their applicability and effectiveness in assessing innovation readiness, particularly within a military context. Among the tools identified was the Defense Acquisition University (DAU) "Innovate to Win" tool. This tool is specifically designed to measure, manage, and scale innovation readiness across the Defense Acquisition Workforce and, by extension, the broader DoD. The Innovate to Win tool encompasses several components, including an Innovation Competencies and Skills Model, a self-assessment for individuals, and curated learning pathways tailored to enhance innovation capabilities. Additionally, it offers performance support resources, such as the Innovate to Win Playbook, which provides practical guidance for leaders to cultivate a culture of innovation within their teams.

Discovery of the DAU Innovate to Win tool following the initial development of the PKAT was significant and timely. While the PKAT was initially developed with specific Navy needs in mind, the identification of Innovate to Win provided valuable insights that informed subsequent refinements to the PKAT, ensuring that it remains relevant and effective throughout its iterative growth.

The AoA process validated the role of the PKAT in addressing specific gaps within the Navy's innovation ecosystem, particularly in assessing the organizational understanding and readiness of JOs to engage in innovative activities specific to the naval enterprise. The inclusion of the DAU Innovate to Win tool in the analysis further emphasized the need for a nuanced approach to innovation readiness, one that incorporates both individual and organizational assessments to foster a culture of informed and strategically aligned innovation within the Navy.



B. ENABLING RISK-TAKING THROUGH PERFORMANCE INCENTIVES

Our research underscores a fundamental truth: for the Navy to foster a culture of intrapreneurship, it must actively support and incentivize risk-taking behaviors. While the concept of intrapreneurship has been discussed at length, it is crucial to reiterate that the path to successful innovation is inherently risky. However, without a performance evaluation system that recognizes and rewards these calculated risks, the motivation to engage in such behaviors diminishes significantly.

Risk-taking, as a core behavior of intrapreneurship articulated by Miller (1983), is not just about daring to be different but about strategically embracing uncertainty to achieve transformative outcomes. In the Navy, fostering such a culture requires more than just encouragement; it demands a systematic approach where risk-taking is embedded into the fabric of performance evaluation. This approach aligns with the principle of risk acceptance highlighted in Army Doctrine Publication (ADP) 6–0, which stresses the necessity for leaders to make decisions that involve inherent risks to achieve mission success.

Despite these doctrinal insights, current practices within the DoD often fall short. The July 2024 DIB report reveals gaps in existing performance evaluation systems rewarding innovation. The emphasis on short-term performance metrics over long-term, potentially high-reward efforts discourages the kind of risk-taking that is essential for breakthrough innovations. Without appropriate recognition, officers may shy away from pursuing innovative solutions, fearing the consequences of failure more than they value the potential for success.

Furthermore, the relationship between intrinsic and extrinsic motivators is worth noting. While intrinsic motivators, such as personal satisfaction from solving complex problems, are powerful, they can be overshadowed by necessary extrinsic factors like promotions and awards. The DIB report highlights that when these extrinsic rewards are not aligned with the objectives of fostering innovation, they can inadvertently stifle the willingness to take risks. Officers are less likely to engage in innovative behaviors if the rewards structure does not adequately reflect the value of their efforts.



ACQUISITION RESEARCH PROGRAM Department of Defense Management Naval Postgraduate School To address these issues, it is imperative that the Navy continue to evolve its performance evaluation systems, such as its Fitness Report (FITREP), to better recognize and reward risk-taking behaviors that drive innovation. By aligning performance metrics with the strategic goals of fostering a culture of innovation supported by intrapreneurial behaviors, the Navy can create an environment where both intrinsic and extrinsic motivators work together to encourage the pursuit of innovative solutions. This section will explore how the current FITREP system addresses these challenges and suggest ways it could be adapted to more effectively promote and reward risk-taking behaviors, ensuring that the Navy remains at the forefront of military innovation.

1. Exploring the Navy's Fitness Reporting System for Intrapreneurial Elements

The Navy's Fitness Report (FITREP) system primarily functions as a tool for communicating an individual's performance to selection boards vice for the member's direct benefit. According to Shenk (1997) in *The Naval Institute Guide to Naval Writing*, the FITREP is designed to present performance metrics for selection boards to review, ensuring that the Navy selects only the most qualified individuals for advancement and key positions, emphasizing that it serves the board, not the individual member's development. Therefore, the FITREPs current purpose and structure may not fully align with the principles of risk-taking essential for fostering intrapreneurship within the service. The FITREP system, last majorly overhauled in the 1990s, has undergone various updates, including the introduction of the eNavFit online interface in 2022. Despite these updates, key findings from a recent Performance Evaluation Needs Assessment conducted by Sae Young Ahn and Latika Hartmann at the Naval Postgraduate School highlight several areas where the FITREP system falls short in promoting innovative and risk-taking behaviors among Navy officers (Ahn & Hartmann, 2022).

The FITREP system's current design primarily focuses on documenting past performance, with a significant emphasis on quantifiable metrics. However, the system tends to conflate performance on individual traits with the overall comparative assessment of an officer. This conflation diminishes the quality of feedback that officers receive, making it challenging to provide meaningful evaluations that encourage risk-taking and



innovation. The system's reliance on a trait average, which is then used to rank individuals against their peers, creates a perverse incentive for reporting seniors to reverse-engineer evaluations to achieve a desired ranking, rather than providing honest, developmental feedback (Ahn & Hartmann, 2022).

Furthermore, the FITREP system's structure does not adequately capture or reward the innovative and risk-taking behaviors that are essential for intrapreneurship. The absence of explicit metrics that evaluate an officer's willingness to take calculated risks or their ability to drive innovative initiatives means that such behaviors are often overlooked or undervalued in the current evaluation framework. As a result, the FITREP system may inadvertently discourage officers from engaging in the very behaviors that are necessary for fostering a culture of innovation within the Navy.

The findings from the Performance Evaluation Needs Assessment suggest that to better align with Miller's (1983) principle of risk-taking, the Navy's FITREP system should incorporate more narrative-based assessments that allow for a nuanced evaluation of an officer's innovative potential and risk-taking behaviors. Additionally, the system should consider separating the evaluation of individual traits from the overall comparative assessment to ensure that officers receive more accurate and constructive feedback that supports their professional growth and encourages intrapreneurial activities.

Recognizing these challenges, the Navy has initiated efforts through the Performance Evaluation Transformation (PET) program to modernize and reform the FITREP and other associated performance evaluation systems. The PET team's work is focused on addressing existing deficiencies, ensuring that the FITREP system better aligns with the Navy's strategic goals of fostering constructive behaviors and outcomes.

In addition to the FITREP system analysis, the Performance Evaluation Needs Assessment included a comprehensive study of performance evaluation systems across multiple services within the DoD. The study, conducted between October 2021 and October 2022, compared the Navy's FITREP system with the evaluation instruments used by the United States Marine Corps (USMC), the United States Army, the United States Air Force, and the United States Coast Guard. These ongoing efforts set the stage for a deeper



exploration of how other performance evaluation systems, such as the USPHS's COER, could inform and enhance the Navy's approach.

2. Case Study: United States Public Health Service's Commissioned Officers Effectiveness Report

Given the Navy's ongoing efforts to reform its performance evaluation system through the PET team, our research extended to examining alternative systems that might offer valuable insights. A key focus of this exploration was the USPHS COER, a system that explicitly integrates innovation and risk-taking into its evaluation criteria.

To understand the effectiveness of the COER in fostering intrapreneurship, we conducted detailed interviews with members of the USPHS who have experience in the administration, implementation and/or have been beneficiaries of the COER system. These interviews provided insights into how the COER is structured to evaluate officer performance across various competencies, with a particular emphasis on innovation, problem-solving, communication, and leadership behaviors.

The COER system is designed to align individual officer goals with the broader organizational objectives of the USPHS, thereby ensuring that officers are incentivized to engage in behaviors that drive organizational improvement and innovation. One of the key strengths identified in the COER is its structured feedback process, which facilitates regular communication between officers and their evaluators throughout the reporting period. This ongoing dialogue not only helps in aligning expectations but also in identifying areas where officers can take calculated risks to advance the mission of the USPHS.

The interviews also revealed that the COER system has been successful in motivating innovative behaviors, though some limitations were noted. For instance, while the COER effectively integrates innovation into its promotion benchmarks in Figure 9 of Appendix B, there is still room for improvement in how it fosters creative thinking across all levels of the organization. The insights gained from the USPHS case study suggest that similar evaluation criteria could be beneficial if integrated into the Navy's FITREP system, particularly as the Navy seeks to encourage intrapreneurial behaviors among its officers.



Following our analysis of the USPHS COER, we conducted further discussions with the PET team to explore how these findings could inform the Navy's ongoing performance evaluation reforms. The PET team, responsible for the development and refinement of the Navy's new evaluation system, shared their focus on enhancing key behaviors such as problem-solving, communication, and leadership—competencies that are also central to the USPHS COER. The PET team emphasized the need for a more structured and comprehensive system that not only assesses these competencies but also recognizes and incentivizes behaviors related to innovation, both explicitly and implicitly.

Our discussions highlighted the potential for the Navy's new evaluation system to adopt elements of the COER, particularly in terms of fostering a culture where risk-taking and innovation are seen as valuable and necessary components of officer performance. The PET team's commitment to refining the system based on feedback and pilot programs aligns closely with our goals in this research, making their ongoing reforms an imperative step in cultivating a more innovative Navy.

By integrating the insights gained from the USPHS COER into the Navy's Performance Evaluation Transformation efforts, there is a clear opportunity to develop a system that better supports and encourages risk-taking behaviors. This integration would ensure that officers are not only prepared to take the necessary risks to drive innovation but are also recognized and rewarded for doing so.

3. Parallel Insights: The Army's Officer Effectiveness Report

As our research progressed, we uncovered similar insights from the United States Army's Officer Evaluation Report (OER) system that align with the principles of intrapreneurship, particularly in fostering risk-taking and innovation. While the Army's OER system was not originally part of our primary case study, its framework presents significant parallels to the Navy's ongoing efforts to reform its own evaluation systems.

The OER system places a strong emphasis on leadership, Mission Command, and achieving results in complex and uncertain environments—core aspects that resonate with the principles of risk-taking and innovation. The system explicitly recognizes officers that



demonstrate the ability to take calculated risks and innovate, thereby aligning with the Army's broader objectives of operational excellence and adaptability.

This recognition is not just theoretical but is embedded in the evaluation criteria, where innovation is explicitly mentioned and rewarded. Officers are encouraged to engage in initiatives that carry inherent risks but have the potential for substantial impact. This approach reinforces the idea that performance evaluations should not only reward successes but also acknowledge the courage and foresight required to pursue innovative solutions.

The structure of the Army's OER system, as shown in Figure 13 of Appendix B, provides a clear visual representation of how innovation is integrated into the evaluation process. By examining the Army's approach, we gained a broader understanding of how performance evaluations can be structured to support and incentivize intrapreneurial behaviors within the military context.

These insights from the Army's OER system offer valuable parallels that can inform the Navy's efforts to refine its own evaluation systems. By continuing to canvas other services to identify best practices, the Navy can further enhance its strategies to foster a culture of innovation and strategic risk-taking among its officers.

C. ENABLING PROACTIVENESS THROUGH ORGANIZATIONAL TRUST

Proactiveness, one of the core behaviors of intrapreneurship, is about anticipating challenges, identifying opportunities, and taking decisive action before circumstances demand it. In the military context, particularly within the Navy, this proactive behavior is intimately connected to the concepts of mutual trust and commander's intent, as outlined in Army Doctrine Publication (ADP) 6–0. These elements are not merely abstract ideals but practical foundations that enable an organization to foster and sustain proactive leadership at all levels (ADP 6–0, 2019).

Mutual trust is the bedrock upon which proactive behavior is built. It is the assurance that leaders and subordinates have in one another, allowing for the delegation of authority and the confident expectation that actions taken at all levels will be aligned with



the organization's overall mission. This trust is reinforced by a clear and consistent communication of the commander's intent—the overarching purpose and desired outcomes of a mission—providing the necessary guidance for subordinates to act with initiative, even in dynamic and uncertain situations (ADP 6–0, 2019).

As an organization cultivates an environment where trust is deeply embedded, it empowers its members to act with foresight and initiative. This organizational understanding—where everyone from senior leaders to JOs can comprehend not only their immediate responsibilities but also how their actions contribute to the broader mission becomes a powerful enabler of proactiveness. It shifts the organizational culture from one of reactive compliance to one of proactive innovation, where officers are encouraged to take the initiative and drive change rather than merely responding to external pressures.

In this context, organizational trust and a shared understanding of the mission create the conditions necessary for proactive leadership. Officers who are confident in the trust placed in them, and who have a clear understanding of their role within the broader strategic framework, are more likely to take the initiative, propose innovative solutions, and act decisively. This culture of trust and mutual understanding is essential for fostering the proactiveness that the Navy requires to remain agile and effective in a rapidly changing world.

1. Barriers to Proactive Leadership in the Navy

Despite the clear benefits of fostering a proactive leadership culture within the Navy, several barriers hinder the development and sustainment of such an environment. The July 2024 DIB report identified multiple systemic and cultural challenges that impede the establishment of organizational trust and, consequently, the cultivation of proactiveness among Navy officers.

One of the primary barriers highlighted in the DIB report is the inconsistency in the communication of commander's intent across different levels of the organization. The report points out that when commander's intent is not clearly and consistently articulated, it creates ambiguity and uncertainty among subordinates. This lack of clarity can lead to hesitation and a reluctance to take initiative, as officers may be unsure whether their actions



align with the broader strategic goals (DIB, 2024). The failure to communicate intent effectively undermines the foundational trust that is necessary for officers to act proactively, as they may fear that their decisions could be misaligned with leadership's expectations.

Another significant barrier is the rigid hierarchical structure that characterizes much of the military's organizational framework. The DIB report notes that this rigidity often stifles initiative by creating an environment where officers are conditioned to wait for explicit orders rather than taking the lead in uncertain situations. Strong emphasis on adherence to chain of command, while vital in many contexts, can discourage the kind of independent thinking and action that proactive leadership requires (DIB, 2024). Officers may fear reprisal for stepping outside the conventional boundaries of their roles, leading to a culture of risk aversion rather than one of calculated risk-taking.

The DIB report also highlights the inconsistency in how proactive behaviors are recognized and rewarded within the Navy. It notes that while some leaders actively encourage and reward initiative, others may inadvertently penalize it, either through negative feedback or by failing to acknowledge the value of proactive actions that do not lead to immediate success (DIB, 2024). This inconsistency can create a disincentive for officers to take the initiative, as the potential for negative consequences may outweigh the perceived benefits of proactive behavior.

Moreover, the report points to the lack of structured feedback mechanisms as a barrier to developing proactive leadership. In environments where feedback is irregular or insufficiently detailed, officers may struggle to understand how their proactive actions are perceived by leadership. This lack of feedback can result in uncertainty about whether their initiative is valued, further inhibiting their willingness to take proactive steps (DIB, 2024).

Finally, the DIB report discusses the broader cultural challenges that exist within the Navy, where a deeply ingrained emphasis on tradition and established procedures can sometimes resist the adoption of new, proactive approaches. This cultural resistance to change can create an environment where innovation and initiative are viewed with skepticism, further constraining the development of proactive leadership (DIB, 2024).



These barriers, as outlined by the DIB, present significant challenges to fostering a culture of proactive leadership within the Navy. Addressing these issues will require a concerted effort to improve communication, reward initiative consistently, and create a more flexible organizational structure that empowers officers to act with foresight and confidence.

2. Building Trust: The Navy's Leadership Assessment Efforts

During our discussions with the PET team, we were informed about various ongoing efforts within the Navy's TMCOE. Among these initiatives, the NLAP emerged as a line of effort aimed at transforming leadership assessment and development across the Navy. The PET team highlighted NLAP as a future-focused initiative designed to complement their efforts by enhancing how leadership is evaluated and cultivated within the service.

The NLAP is designed to modernize and standardize the Navy's leadership assessment processes, ensuring that they are data-driven, transparent, and tailored to the unique needs of different Type Commanders (TYCOMs) and Navy communities. Its mission is to identify and develop leaders who not only excel in traditional metrics but also possess the character, potential, and community-specific values necessary to foster trust and lead effectively in complex environments.

Although still in development, the NLAP represents a significant shift towards a more comprehensive approach to leadership assessment. It incorporates a range of evaluation methods, including cognitive and non-cognitive assessments, interviews with operational psychologists, and structured feedback from community leaders. These assessments are designed to provide a holistic view of a leader's capabilities, focusing not only on their technical skills but also on their ability to build and maintain trust within their teams.

The NLAP's focus on trust-building is particularly relevant in addressing several barriers to proactive leadership that have been identified within the Navy and the broader DoD. The DIB report, for instance, highlights inconsistencies in leadership evaluations as a significant barrier to fostering a culture of proactiveness. The structured and transparent



feedback processes embedded in the NLAP aim to mitigate these inconsistencies, ensuring that leaders receive clear, actionable feedback that encourages them to take initiative and act with confidence.

Moreover, the NLAP is poised to enhance trust within the Navy's leadership ranks by reinforcing the importance of integrity, transparency, and accountability in leadership roles. As these policies and procedures are fully implemented, they are expected to create a more trust-based leadership environment, where officers are empowered to lead proactively and make decisions that align with the Navy's strategic objectives.

While the NLAP is not yet fully operational, its development represents a hopeful and forward-looking effort to build a foundation of trust and proactiveness within the Navy's leadership. By addressing the barriers identified in current leadership assessments and fostering a culture of trust, the NLAP is expected to play a consistent role in preparing the Navy's future leaders to navigate the complexities of modern military operations, ultimately enhancing the Navy's effectiveness and adaptability in a rapidly changing global landscape.

This section reflects our understanding of the NLAP's potential as an integral part of the Navy's ongoing efforts to develop proactive, trust-based leadership. The insights gained from our discussions with the PET team underscore the importance of this initiative and its alignment with broader talent management goals within the Navy.



THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK


VI. FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

A. INTRODUCTION

This chapter presents the key findings from our research, along with actionable recommendations designed to address identified challenges and leverage opportunities within the Navy. These findings and recommendations are consistent with those outlined in the executive summary to maintain coherence and provide a clear pathway for implementation. Additionally, we outline areas for further research that are crucial for supporting the long-term development and sustainability of intrapreneurial initiatives within the Navy.

B. FINDINGS

Our research has revealed several key insights that are vital for understanding and enhancing leadership and intrapreneurship within the Navy:

(1) Intrapreneurial Behaviors and Mission Command Principles

Intrapreneurial behaviors are closely aligned with Mission Command principles, particularly in promoting decentralized decision-making. By empowering JOs to innovate more effectively, these behaviors have the potential to significantly enhance the Navy's operational flexibility and responsiveness, supporting the broader objective of Mission Command to foster initiative and adaptability at all levels of command.

(2) Support for OPMEP Desired Leader Attributes

Promoting intrapreneurial behaviors among JOs directly supports adherence to the OPMEP DLAs. These behaviors not only align with the DLAs but also have the potential to positively impact retention by creating a more engaging and empowering environment for JOs, thereby enhancing leadership development and retention within the Navy.

(3) Enhancements Needed in the Navy's Performance Evaluation System

There are opportunities within the current initiatives to enhance the Navy's Performance Evaluation System (PES) to more explicitly highlight the recognition and



promotion of innovative behaviors among the JO cadre, ultimately incentivizing intrapreneurial action, which is vital for the Navy's long-term success. A PES that more precisely acknowledges and rewards innovation could drive a cultural shift towards greater creativity and problem-solving at all levels.

(4) Initial PKAT Development and the Need for Modern Digital Tools

The initial development of the PKAT highlighted the need for modern digital tools and methodologies that can deliver tailored knowledge assessments across a broad spectrum of professional warfighting competencies. These tools are essential for ensuring that the Navy's training and assessment programs remain relevant and effective in a rapidly evolving technological landscape.

C. CONCLUSION

The findings from our research underscore the critical need for the United States Navy to foster intrapreneurial behaviors within its cadre of approximately 45,000 junior officers, particularly in alignment with Mission Command principles and Joint leadership development expectations. By addressing the identified gaps in its performance evaluations systems and enhancing the tools available for knowledge assessment, the Navy can cultivate a more proactive and innovative leadership culture. This shift is not only vital for the Navy's current operational effectiveness but also for ensuring its ability to adapt to and overcome future challenges.

Moreover, promoting intrapreneurial behaviors such as innovativeness, risk-taking, and proactiveness—behaviors outlined by Miller (1983)—has the potential to significantly increase the Navy's retention rates. Innovativeness, when encouraged, allows JOs to develop and implement novel solutions that can directly impact the Navy's strategic goals. Risk-taking, when supported within a framework that values calculated risks, can lead to breakthroughs that drive both personal and organizational growth. Proactiveness, as enabled by a culture of trust and clear commander's intent, empowers officers to anticipate challenges and act decisively, reinforcing their value within the organization.



Creating an environment where JOs feel empowered to innovate, take risks, and act proactively will likely lead to higher job satisfaction, as these officers see their ideas and contributions valued and implemented over time. This style of empowerment aligns directly with the OPMEP DLAs, which emphasize leadership qualities that inspire loyalty and commitment among service members. As JOs become more engaged and motivated by opportunities to drive innovation and influence change, the Navy can expect to see a positive impact on retention, reducing unmitigated loss of institutional knowledge during turnover and preserving the talent that is crucial for long-term success.

In conclusion, fostering a culture of intrapreneurship within the Navy, grounded in Miller's (1983) intrapreneurial behaviors of innovativeness, risk-taking, and proactiveness, presents a dual benefit: enhancing both operational effectiveness and retention. By embracing these behaviors, the Navy can better harness the innovative potential of its JOs, ensuring that the organization remains agile, resilient, and ready to meet the challenges of the future. This approach not only supports the Navy's strategic goals but also contributes to the overall modernization efforts necessary to maintain superiority in an increasingly complex global landscape with emerging peer adversaries.

D. PRIMARY RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Test and Refine PKAT Effectiveness

We recommend conducting extensive testing and refinement of the PKAT by collecting insights and feedback from JOs across multiple units and organizational levels within the DON. This iterative process will help ensure that the PKAT is effectively tailored to the Navy's needs and can accurately assess the level of knowledge and general competencies required for modern warfighting.

2. Enhance the Navy's Performance Evaluation System

To better recognize and promote intrapreneurial behaviors among Navy JOs, we recommend enhancing the Navy's PES by researching and integrating best practices and lessons learned from the USPHS COER and the Army's OER, specifically insights on how explicit mentioning of innovation in their systems influences the performance of USPHS



and Army JOS. These systems offer valuable insights into how performance evaluations can be structured to encourage innovation and initiative, and adapting these practices to the Navy's context could positively influence emerging changes to the Navy's FITREP and Eval Systems.

3. Integrating Intrapreneurial Behaviors into Leadership Curricula

We recommend identifying and integrating intrapreneurial behaviors into existing leadership curricula to bolster the acceptance of Mission Command principles among Navy JOs. Embedding these principles into leadership training programs will help create a more cohesive and proactive leadership culture that aligns with the Navy's strategic goals.

4. Define and Promulgate Comprehensive Innovation Policies

Finally, we recommend defining and promulgating comprehensive and actionable organizational innovation policies to ensure that JOs across all levels of command have access to the resources and opportunities necessary to innovate. These policies should be designed to remove barriers to innovation, provide clear guidance on how to pursue new ideas, and ensure that intrapreneurial behaviors are consistently encouraged and rewarded.

E. RECOMMENDED AREAS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

To support the continuous improvement and long-term sustainability of intrapreneurial initiatives within the Navy, we recommend the following areas for further research:

1. Longitudinal Studies

Conduct longitudinal studies to assess the long-term impact of intrapreneurial initiatives on organizational performance and innovation within the Navy. Longitudinal studies will provide valuable insights into the sustainability and effectiveness of these programs, allowing for adjustments and enhancements over time.



2. Cross-Branch Comparisons

Perform cross-branch comparisons of intrapreneurial behaviors and outcomes across different branches of the military to identify best practices and areas for improvement. Such comparisons can reveal successful intrapreneurial strategies that could be adopted across the DoD, thereby enhancing the effectiveness of these initiatives.

3. International Benchmarks

Study intrapreneurial practices in military organizations from other countries to benchmark and adapt successful strategies for the Navy. International benchmarking can offer new perspectives and innovative approaches to fostering intrapreneurship that could be integrated into the Navy's own practices.

4. Technology Integration

Investigate the role of emerging technologies in supporting intrapreneurial activities and how they can be integrated into existing Navy frameworks. This research should focus on how digital platforms and advanced technologies can enhance intrapreneurial capabilities, streamline processes, and support continuous learning within the Navy.

5. Impact of Organizational Culture

Examine the impact of organizational culture on intrapreneurial behavior within the Navy and identify ways to cultivate a supportive environment. A supportive organizational culture is vital for fostering intrapreneurial behaviors, and this research should explore strategies for aligning organizational values with intrapreneurial goals.

The aforementioned areas for potential further research are crucial for ensuring the ongoing refinement and effectiveness of leadership development and intrapreneurial initiatives within the Navy, helping the service to cultivate leaders who are prepared to meet future challenges with innovation and adaptability.



ACQUISITION RESEARCH PROGRAM Department of Defense Management Naval Postgraduate School



APPENDIX A. PROTOTYPE KNOWLEDGE ASSESSMENT TOOL

A. BACKGROUND

This research explored how intrapreneurship could be leveraged to enhance the Navy's readiness and retention. Focusing on the innovative potential of junior officers (JOs), the study sought to develop tools and frameworks that assess and enhance their intrapreneurial capabilities. A key outcome of this research was the development of the Prototype Knowledge Assessment Tool (PKAT), designed to identify knowledge gaps among JOs and provide tailored resources, training, and education to support their ability to generate actionable feedback. The study underscored the importance of organizational support, targeted training, and ongoing assessments in cultivating a culture of innovation within the Navy.

B. SCOPE

PKAT development was grounded in Miller's (1983) principles of intrapreneurial behavior to ensure the product maintained strict alignment with the core research objectives of this thesis. This mitigated potential survey question creep or unnecessary complexity. Furthermore, the PKAT was specifically designed for Navy JOs, addressing the unique challenges and opportunities they encounter in their operational environment.

C. RELEVANCE TO MILLER'S PRINCIPLE OF INNOVATIVENESS

PKAT development was closely aligned with Miller's (1983) principle of innovativeness, which emphasizes the importance of generating and implementing new ideas within an organization. In this context, intrapreneurship was identified as a critical element for driving continuous improvement and operational effectiveness within the Navy. The assessment of JOs' understanding of the Navy's organizational structures was seen as essential for fostering innovative outcomes. The PKAT was developed to pinpoint areas where innovative behaviors could be effectively nurtured, ensuring that the innovative potential of JOs is recognized and nurtured.



D. WORK DISTRIBUTION STRATEGY

The development team for the PKAT was composed of four thesis members, each selected for their unique background to strategically influence the tool's design and development process.

1. Strategic Selection of Developers

Out of the four thesis team members, one member had extensive experience in survey development. This member was deliberately removed from the direct PKAT development process to ensure the initial tool represented the average experience level of a Navy JO, rather than one with specialized knowledge in survey design. The goal was to create a PKAT that would be more relatable and practical for the broader JO cadre.

Another member, the isolated reviewer, had some training in survey development from their undergraduate education in Business Administration. This reviewer provided insights during the review phase but was not involved in the initial development to maintain the focus on creating a tool from the perspective of a standard JO.

The two primary developers were specifically chosen because they lacked formal training, education, or experience in developing, distributing, collecting, or analyzing the effectiveness of official surveys. This was a deliberate decision to best represent the ambient requirements and typical experience of an average Navy JO. By selecting developers who mirrored the general JO population, the team aimed to establish a robust foundation for the PKAT's first iteration, ensuring it would resonate with its intended users.

2. Educational and Professional Background

The primary developers had diverse educational backgrounds, with one holding a Bachelor's degree in Business Finance and a Master's degree in East Asian Languages and Literature, and the other holding a Bachelor's degree in Health Science and a Master's degree in Industrial and Organizational Psychology. Their education provided strong analytical and problem-solving skills, though not in survey design, which allowed them to approach PKAT development with a focus on user needs and innovative potential rather than traditional survey methodologies.



Professionally, both developers had extensive experience in the Navy, serving in roles such as food service officer, disbursing officer, aviation supply depot officer, logistics planner, and Navy acquisition and contracting. As department heads, they served in a diverse environment in respect to platforms as well such as a Guided Missile Submarine and an Amphibious Transport Dock (LPD). These roles provided them with a deep understanding of Navy operations and the challenges JOs face in implementing innovation, which directly influenced the content and focus of the PKAT.

E. NAVY SURVEY EXPERIENCES: IMPACT ON PKAT DEVELOPMENT

The developers' experiences with Navy surveys played a significant role in shaping the PKAT's design. Both developers had minimal faith in the effectiveness of existing Navy surveys, having frequently encountered survey fatigue and perceived lack of actionable outcomes from existing survey tools like the Defense Organizational Climate Survey (DEOCS). These experiences influenced the PKAT's development in several ways:

1. Survey Fatigue Mitigation

Recognizing the prevalence of survey fatigue among JOs, an initial limit of 40 questions was set to prioritize a positive user experience and sustain engagement. This limit was later expanded as the tool was refined, but the emphasis on brevity and relevance was a priority.

2. Focus on Actionable Insights

The developers were committed to ensuring that the PKAT would produce actionable insights. It was designed to provide meaningful feedback that could directly inform training and development resources for innovation development, addressing a gap they identified in existing Navy surveys.

F. PKAT DEVELOPMENT PROCESS

PKAT development followed a structured, iterative process, divided into four distinct phases. Activities during each phase are categorized based on the parties involved, and the specific steps taken by the developers:



1. Discovery Phase

The objective of the Discovery Phase was to establish a foundational understanding of intrapreneurial behaviors and identify existing tools relevant to the PKAT's terminal objectives. Specific activities included:

a. Conditioning

The two primary developers began by separately completing the "Innovation Climate Questionnaire" from the book *Intrapreneuring in Action* by Gifford Pinchot and Ron Pellman (1999). This questionnaire served as an initial benchmark for understanding intrapreneurial behaviors within an organizational context.

b. Brainstorming

After completing the questionnaire individually, the developers compared their answers and discussed initial insights, allowed them to identify key themes and common gaps that could inform the development of the PKAT.

c. Application

With these insights, the developers began formulating initial questions for the PKAT, ensuring that the tool would align with the themes identified in their analysis of the questionnaire.

2. Framing Phase

The objective of the Framing Phase was to create a preliminary version of the PKAT. The total number of questions was deliberately limited to 40 to avoid survey fatigue and encourage meaningful responses in future dissemination. Specific activities included:

a. Ideation

The primary developers met regularly to incrementally build the PKAT, starting with the themes and gaps identified during the Discovery Phase. They focused on clarity, relevance, and alignment with the research objectives.



ACQUISITION RESEARCH PROGRAM Department of Defense Management Naval Postgraduate School

b. Outlining

Each session involved revising existing questions and adding new ones based on their ongoing discussions, with an emphasis on creating a tool that was practical and directly applicable to JOs. The goal was to ensure that the PKAT remained user-friendly and targeted identifying actionable insights.

3. Revision Phase

The objective of the Revision Phase was to incorporate feedback in a hierarchal fashion from within the thesis team to the highest levels of leadership in the Navy to refine PKAT structure and relevance. This involved engaging the isolated reviewer within the thesis team, the lead thesis advisor, and leadership from the Navy Problem Solving Office and Navy Survey Program in series. Specific activities included:

a. Isolated Reviewer Feeback

The isolated reviewer, who had some undergraduate training in survey development, reviewed the initial version of the PKAT. This reviewer's feedback focused on the structure and clarity of the questions, suggesting revisions to improve the tool's effectiveness. The primary developers incorporated this feedback, refining the PKAT's questions to ensure they were clear, relevant, and aligned with the intended objectives.

b. Thesis Advisor Feedback

After the internal review, the PKAT was submitted to the thesis advisor for further feedback. The advisor's review emphasized ensuring the tool's academic rigor and alignment with the research goals. This feedback led to additional revisions, particularly in fine-tuning the questions for clarity and ensuring that the PKAT met the necessary standards for academic research.

c. Navy Problem Solving Office Feedback

Following the advisor's feedback, the PKAT was reviewed by representatives from the Navy Problem Solving Office. Their feedback provided critical insights into how the PKAT could be applied within the Navy, highlighting areas where the tool needed to be



more practical and actionable. This review resulted in significant revisions and an expansion of the PKAT from 40 to 61 questions, with a focus on ensuring that the tool was directly applicable to the Navy's operational context.

4. Refinement Phase

The objective of the Refinement Phase was to finalize the PKAT for submission and future deployment, ensuring it was comprehensive, actionable, and user-friendly. Specific activities included:

a. Navy Survey Program Office Feedback

The final phase began with a comprehensive review by the Navy Survey Program Office. Their feedback was crucial in refining and expanding the PKAT to ensure it met the Navy's standards for survey tools.

b. Modification and Expansion

Based on this feedback, the PKAT was expanded from 61 to 70 questions, with additional revisions made to improve clarity, relevance, and the overall impact of the questions. This final round of revisions aimed to ensure the PKAT was both comprehensive and practical for deployment.

G. ANALYSIS OF ALTERNATIVES

At the tail end of PKAT development, an analysis of alternatives (AoA) was conducted to ensure the tool was both unique and effective. This analysis followed the methodology outlined in DoDI 5000.85 (2020), Major Capability Acquisition (MCA), which emphasizes the importance of evaluating different potential solutions to identify the best option. DoDI 5000.85 (2020) guides decision-makers in resource allocation, performance evaluation, and risk management to ensure the optimal selection of solutions in capability development.

During the final stages of the Refinement Phase, the development team discovered the Defense Acquisition University's (DAU) "Innovate to Win" tool as an adequate platform for comparison. Since this tool was identified after the Navy Survey Program



Office review, it did not influence the final development of the PKAT. The team conducted a thorough comparative analysis to understand the overlaps and differences between the two tools, which would inform potential future refinements of the PKAT.

The DAU "Innovate to Win" tool, illustrated in Figure 4, is designed to build an innovative workforce within the Department of Defense (DoD). The "Innovate to Win" tool employs a comprehensive Innovation Competencies & Skills Model that operates through a three-step approach:

a. Innovation Competencies and Skills

The model categorizes innovation competencies into three domains of practice: Thinking, Collaborating, and Cultivating.

- Thinking: This domain focuses on competencies such as Growth Mindset, Risk-Taking, Creativity, Critical Thinking, and Futures Thinking.
- **Collaborating:** This domain includes competencies like Collaborating, Networking, Allyship, and Communicating.
- **Cultivating:** This domain covers competencies such as Observing, Experimenting, adopting a Holistic Approach, Driving Change, Integrating, and Lifelong Learning.

b. Self-Assessment

The tool aligns with the identified Innovation Competencies & Skills and includes a self-administered assessment using 48 Likert-scale statements, designed to be completed in under 10 minutes. The assessment leverages research-backed models and industry practices to provide users with immediate feedback on their innovation competencies.

c. Curated Learning Pathways

Based on the self-assessment results, the tool offers curated learning pathways that are mapped to Bloom's Taxonomy (Bloom, 1956). These pathways provide continuous personalized learning experiences, offering resources to improve identified competencies.



The "Innovate to Win" process is designed to save time and promote lifelong learning, aligning with the specific domains of Thinking, Collaborating, and Cultivating.



Figure 4. DAU Innovate to Win model. Source: DAU

While the DAU "Innovate to Win" tool is designed for a broad DoD audience, the PKAT is specifically tailored for Navy JOs O1-O4) within the Department of the Navy (DON). This distinction influenced the design and focus of each tool, with the PKAT more narrowly focused on the operational environment and challenges specific to JOs, ensuring it directly addresses their unique needs and experiences.

This analysis under DoDI 5000.85 (2020) allowed the team to validate the uniqueness and relevance of the PKAT within its intended demographic. The PKAT's design reflects its targeted application within the Navy, addressing the specific needs of JOs to enhance their ability to provide innovative feedback and recommendations. Additionally, the comparison with the DAU tool highlighted potential areas for future enhancement of the PKAT, particularly in the incorporation of elements that could further refine the tool's effectiveness in assessing and developing intrapreneurial capabilities.



Ultimately, the PKAT comprises three categories of questions: Human Element, Basic Knowledge, and Education and Training. Unlike the DAU's uniform five-point Likert scale, the PKAT includes various question formats to enhance engagement and better assess the innovative potential of JOs within their specific command environments. This tailored approach ensures that the PKAT is optimally aligned with the unique challenges and opportunities faced by Navy JOs.

H. INTRODUCTION TO ENHANCEMENT TOOLS

During the Discovery Phase of PKAT development, the thesis team was introduced to a range of advanced tools and technologies that could potentially enhance the effectiveness of feedback collection and survey solicitation. This introduction revealed that there are existing Navy initiatives, both funded and unfunded, focused on acquisition and maturation of emerging technologies designed to improve how feedback is gathered and leveraged.

Among the tools the team was introduced to were sophisticated artificial intelligence (AI) and crowdsourcing platforms, which have significant potential to augment traditional survey methods. Notably, some AI-driven tools are being used to enhance the front end of surveying and training by improving the assessment of an individual's needs. These tools utilize performance indicators such as gaze patterns, interaction duration with content, and response latency. By analyzing these factors, AI can dynamically adjust the survey experience, pulling relevant questions from a large question bank rather than delivering a static, linear survey. This adaptive approach helps mitigate survey fatigue and maximize the accuracy of individual competency assessments.

This focus on enhancing front-end user engagement is critical because the effectiveness of the PKAT tool hinges heavily on the user experience. By potentially leveraging AI to tailor the survey in real-time, the tool can maintain user engagement while providing a more accurate assessment of the individual's knowledge and skills.

Additionally, other tools may help manage the back-end processes of the PKAT application. These tools focus on rapidly identifying and delivering tailored training, education, and resources to address identified knowledge gaps. The combination of these



ACQUISITION RESEARCH PROGRAM Department of Defense Management Naval Postgraduate School front-end and back-end enhancements could significantly elevate PKAT's delivery and capability. By enabling JOs to quickly assess their own level of knowledge and receive immediate guidance on how to fill gaps, these tools could drastically improve an individual's ability to synthesize and deliver feedback and innovative recommendations to leadership.

Introduction to these advanced tools led the primary developers to make a critical decision regarding the first iteration of the PKAT. While recognizing the potential of these technologies, the developers chose not to attempt integrating them into the initial version of the PKAT due to bandwidth, resourcing, and maturity requirements. Specifically, the products they were introduced to were not expected to be available before the thesis deadline. Instead, they focused on ensuring that the fundamental development of the tool was a solid standalone product that could be effectively deployed without relying on these emerging technologies. However, the awareness of these tools significantly influenced their intentions for future iterations of the PKAT.

Specifically, the developers felt more comfortable lifting the original arbitrary boundary of 40 questions, which had been set to prevent survey fatigue. Knowing that downstream technologies could potentially mitigate survey fatigue by enabling adaptive, user-tailored processes, they were more willing to expand the question set, provided that each question was still relevant. This decision allowed the PKAT to be more comprehensive in its initial form, while leaving room for future integration of AI and other tools to enhance the user experience and effectiveness of the assessment.

This approach reflects the developers' commitment to creating a robust foundation for the PKAT, with a clear pathway for future enhancements that could further refine the tool and maximize its impact on Navy JOs' ability to contribute innovative recommendations to leadership.

I. ASSESSING INTRAPRENEURIAL RELEVANCE AND POTENTIAL FOR BROADER APPLICATION

The primary developers of the PKAT conducted a subjective, question-by-question review of both the PKAT and the DAU's "Innovate to Win" tool to determine the extent



to which the questions address Miller's (1983) behaviors of intrapreneurship: risk-taking and proactiveness. While the PKAT was fundamentally designed to drive Miller's behavior of innovativeness, this granular analysis revealed that some questions within both tools also naturally align with the behaviors of risk-taking and proactiveness.

In this analysis, it was discovered that questions in the PKAT related to proactiveness account for 27%, and those related to risk-taking for 18%. In comparison, within the DAU's "Innovate to Win" self-assessment, proactiveness is represented by 38% of the questions, and risk-taking by 23%.

Through this detailed examination, the developers identified specific questions within the PKAT and DAU tools that, although not explicitly categorized, contribute to the broader intrapreneurial framework outlined by Miller (1983). The focus on these additional elements of intrapreneurship—risk-taking and proactiveness—complements the primary objective of fostering innovativeness, offering a more holistic view of how the PKAT could be utilized and refined in the future.

Moreover, the PKAT's unique strength lies in its tailored approach to addressing the specific needs of Navy JOs. The tool's primary purpose and power are rooted in its ability to cater to the niche requirements of these officers, ensuring that it is highly relevant and effective within the Navy's operational context. An analysis of the PKAT identifies that 27 out of 70 questions, or 39%, are specifically tailored to the Navy. These Navyspecific questions address unique challenges and scenarios encountered by JOs, making the PKAT an invaluable tool for fostering innovation within the Navy.

However, the remaining 43 out of 70 questions, or 61%, have broader applicability across the Department of Defense (DoD). This finding suggests that while the PKAT is highly specialized for the Navy, it also has the potential to be adapted for use in other services, including the Army, Air Force, Space Force, Marines, and Coast Guard. By examining how much of the PKAT is Navy-specific, other services can identify the elements that are most relevant to their contexts, potentially leading to a broader implementation of the tool across the DoD, especially if able to leverage AI tools.



ACQUISITION RESEARCH PROGRAM Department of Defense Management Naval Postgraduate School This analysis was conducted solely to incite future discussions on how to contextually view the PKAT within the broader scope of intrapreneurship and to inform potential refinements of the tool. Furthermore, successful implementation of the PKAT within the Navy has the potential to inform its application in other services by providing a model of how to bridge the gap between broad DoD-level resources like the DAU tool and the specific innovation requirements at the component level. There is a significant opportunity for a symbiotic relationship between the DAU tool as a DoD-level resource and the PKAT as a specialized tool that can meet the unique needs of various services, beginning with the Navy.

J. ALIGNMENT WITH PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION AND RETENTION GOALS

The importance of assessing organizational knowledge is underscored by the guidance provided in CJCSI 1800.01G, which outlines the Officer Professional Military Education Policy (OPMEP). The OPMEP is a foundational document that establishes the framework for Joint Professional Military Education (JPME) across the services. It emphasizes the need for a rigorous learning environment that promotes a comprehensive understanding of joint goals and evolving areas of interest, ensuring that officers are equipped with the knowledge, skills, and abilities necessary to succeed across a continuum of operations, from armed conflict to competition prior to armed conflict (CJCSI 1800.01G, 2024).

The OPMEP stresses the critical importance of preparing officers to operate in complex, dynamic environments characterized by rapid technological advancements, unconventional threats, and the necessity for integrated, multi-domain operations. It highlights the need for officers to develop strategic thinking skills and the ability to adapt to emerging ways of war, which include cyber warfare, space operations, and information warfare (CJCSI 1800.01G, 2024). These competencies are vital for ensuring that military leaders can effectively contribute to national security in an increasingly interconnected and contested global environment.



The PKAT is designed to directly support these objectives by assessing and enhancing the innovative potential of JOs through a focused evaluation of their understanding of organizational architectures. By identifying knowledge gaps and providing tailored training, education, and facilitation resources, the PKAT ensures that JOs are better prepared to contribute to the Navy's operational effectiveness and innovation. This aligns with the OPMEP's mandate to maintain a broad and adaptable curriculum that equips officers with the necessary competencies to face emerging challenges.

As the PKAT tool continues to be refined, it has the potential to significantly enhance the Navy and DoD's mission to imbue JOs with the joint competencies needed throughout their professional education journey. Within the Navy as a service component, the PKAT serves as a critical resource for fostering innovation and deepening understanding of Navy-specific organizational structures. Moreover, as JOs progress through their careers, the PKAT helps equip them with the foundational knowledge and innovative mindset needed to effectively operate within and contribute to the broader joint operational environment. This holistic development supports the OPMEP's emphasis on preparing officers to think critically, apply military power creatively, and operate effectively across all domains (CJCSI 1800.01G, 2024).

In addition to enhancing operational effectiveness, these efforts also provide opportunities to improve retention within the Navy. The PKAT fosters a sense of purpose and engagement among officers by enabling JOs to more competently add value to existing Navy initiatives and address complex challenges. This increased competence and ability to contribute meaningfully to the Navy's mission can enhance job satisfaction and career fulfillment, ultimately leading to higher retention rates among talented officers.

In conclusion, the PKAT is a critical tool that not only fosters innovation within the Navy but also supports the broader goals of the OPMEP. By assessing and addressing the knowledge gaps of JOs, the PKAT aligns with the OPMEP's emphasis on comprehensive professional military education and contributes to the Navy's ability to cultivate a culture of innovation. This alignment ensures that the Navy's leaders are well-equipped to meet the demands of future challenges, thereby enhancing the overall effectiveness of the Navy's



operational capabilities while also contributing to improved retention by empowering JOs to add tangible value to the organization.

K. NAVY JUNIOR OFFICER PROTOTYPE KNOWLEDGE ASSESSMENT TOOL

Personal Background:

1. Rank: Drop-down menu (O-1 to O-4)

2. Designator:

3. Years of Service: _____

4. Years of Commissioned Service (if prior enlisted):

5. Highest Education: Drop-down menu (High School Diploma or equivalent, BA, BS, MA, MS, MBA, PhD, Other)

6. Work Experience Outside of Navy: Drop-down menu (Yes or No)

If yes, provide industry details:

*** START SURVEY ***

- 1. How do you rate your communication skills with your subordinates?
- a) Excellent
- b) Above average
- c) Average
- d) Below average
- e) Needs improvement
- 2. How do you rate your communication skills with your peers?



- a) Excellent
- b) Above average
- c) Average
- d) Below average
- e) Needs improvement
- 3. How do you rate your communication skills with your superiors?
- a) Excellent
- b) Above average
- c) Average
- d) Below average
- e) Needs improvement

4. As a JO, how empowered do you feel to propose a change in process at your command?

a) Very: At my command, JOs are encouraged to propose initiatives

b) Somewhat: At my command, there is some scope for JOs to initiate new ideas

- c) Rarely: At my command, proposals for change by JOs are not welcomed
- 5. Overall, how would you describe the culture at your command?
- a) Collaborative and High Performing
- b) Enthusiastic but Underperforming
- c) Efficient but Disconnected



d) Disengaged and Ineffective

6. Yes or No: Do you think a change is required in your current command's culture? If yes, explain:

- 7. How important are the education and/or training opportunities provided by the Navy to you personally?
- a) Very important
- b) Somewhat important
- c) Slightly important
- d) Not at all important

8. I believe my Fitness Report(s) captures my performance fairly, completely, and properly.

- a) Strongly agree
- b) Somewhat agree
- c) Neither agree nor disagree
- d) Somewhat disagree
- e) Strongly disagree

9. How often have you requested an office call with a senior officer (an office call is conducted as mentorship/guidance from a senior officer)?

- a) Regularly: I have regular office calls with senior officer(s)
- b) Occasionally: I have had occasional office calls with senior officer(s)
- c) Never: I have never had an office call with a senior officer



- 10. How valuable do you feel networking is for career progression?
- a) Very valuable
- b) Somewhat valuable
- c) Slightly valuable
- d) Not at all valuable
- e) Do not know
- 11. How often do you check your professional records?
- a) Monthly
- b) Quarterly
- c) Annually
- d) As required before a board
- e) I never check them

12. To what extent do you use social media to acquire information to perform your job/duties?

- a) Frequently
- b) Occasionally
- c) Rarely
- d) Never

13. If applicable, which social media platform/source do you use to acquire information?



- a) Official platform/source (e.g. USS ALWAYS AT SEA)
- b) Unofficial platform/source (e.g. JOPA)
- 14. How do you feel about the detailing experience in the Navy?
- a) Very satisfied
- b) Satisfied
- c) Neutral
- d) Dissatisfied
- e) Very unsatisfied

15. How satisfied are you with the billet(s) you have been detailed to so far in your career?

- a) Very satisfied
- b) Satisfied
- c) Neutral
- d) Unsatisfied
- e) Very unsatisfied

16. Leadership at my command encourages JOs to speak up when they have something to share.

- a) Strongly agree
- b) Somewhat agree
- c) Neither agree nor disagree



- d) Disagree
- e) Strongly disagree

17. Do you have a mentor you regularly keep in touch with? If yes, how often? (Skip, if no)

- a) Daily
- b) Weekly
- c) Monthly
- d) Quarterly
- e) Few times a year
- f) Only when needed
- 18. If you do not have a mentor, why do you not have one?
- a) I feel that I do not need a mentor right now
- b) I do not want a mentor right now
- c) I do not know how to find a mentor
- d) I do not have the time to find a mentor right now
- 19. Do you feel like you trend towards an entrepreneurial orientation?
- a) Yes
- b) No
- c) Do not know
- 20. To what extent do you feel like you can speak openly at your command?
- a) Very: At my command, I feel I could speak openly



- b) Somewhat: At my command, I feel I could speak openly sometimes
- c) Rarely: At my command, I do not feel I could speak openly

21. How often are you able to work on collateral projects/duties outside of your primary duties during normal working hours?

- a) Regularly
- b) Occasionally
- c) Rarely
- d) Never

22. When encountering a problem, do you tend to look-up formal instruction(s) first or ask for someone's help first?

- a) Look up the instruction(s) first
- b) Ask for someone's help

23. If you run into a problem or issue, who do you feel you can ask for help?(Select all that apply).

- a) Peers
- b) Supervisor
- c) Teammates
- d) Your Chief
- e) Your Mentor
- f) I ask someone for help but check the instruction after doing so.



- 24. When faced with a difficult decision, do you primarily rely on:
- a) Gut instinct
- b) Analyzing available data
- c) Seeking input from others
- d) Following established protocols
- 25. How often do you feel that you are proactive, innovative, and risk-taking?
- a) Frequently
- b) Occasionally
- c) Rarely
- d) Never

26. Which of the following best describes your proficiency in communication skills during group discussions?

- a) Advanced
- b) Intermediate
- c) Beginner

27. Continuous learning is necessary for staying relevant and effective in the Navy.

- a) Strong agree
- b) Somewhat agree
- c) Neither agree nor disagree
- d) Disagree



e) Strongly disagree

28. How important is teamwork for accomplishing Navy missions successfully?

- a) Very important
- b) Somewhat important
- c) Slightly important
- d) Not at all important

29. How comfortable are you with adapting to changes in your work environment?

- a) Very comfortable
- b) Somewhat comfortable
- c) Neutral
- d) Somewhat uncomfortable
- e) Not comfortable at all

30. How easy or difficult do you find executing your duties in an unpredictable work environment? (e.g. Ship's schedule changes)

- a) Easy
- b) Somewhat easy
- c) Neutral
- d) Somewhat difficult
- e) Difficult



31. Do you feel like you have passion and perseverance (e.g., grit) when working towards a goal?

- a) Always
- b) Often
- c) Sometimes
- d) Rarely
- e) Never

32. How do the following statements identify with you (Questions 32–41, Angela Duckworth's Grit Scale): New ideas and projects sometimes distract me from previous ones.

- a) Very much like me
- b) Mostly like me
- c) Somewhat like me
- d) Not much like me
- e) Not like me at all
- 33. Setbacks DON'T discourage me. I DON'T give up easily.
- a) Very much like me
- b) Mostly like me
- c) Somewhat like me
- d) Not much like me
- e) Not like me at all



- 34. I often set a goal but later choose to pursue a different one.
- a) Very much like me
- b) Mostly like me
- c) Somewhat like me
- d) Not much like me
- e) Not like me at all
- 35. I am a hard worker.
- a) Very much like me
- b) Mostly like me
- c) Somewhat like me
- d) Not much like me
- e) Not like me at all

36. I have difficulty maintaining my focus on projects that take more than a few months to complete.

- a) Very much like me
- b) Mostly like me
- c) Somewhat like me
- d) Not much like me
- e) Not like me at all
- 37. I finish whatever I begin.



- a) Very much like me
- b) Mostly like me
- c) Somewhat like me
- d) Not much like me
- e) Not like me at all
- 38. My interests change from year to year.
- a) Very much like me
- b) Mostly like me
- c) Somewhat like me
- d) Not much like me
- e) Not like me at all
- 39. I am diligent. I never give up.
- a) Very much like me
- b) Mostly like me
- c) Somewhat like me
- d) Not much like me
- e) Not like me at all

40. I have been obsessed with a certain idea or project for a short time but later lost interest.

- a) Very much like me
- b) Mostly like me



- c) Somewhat like me
- d) Not much like me
- e) Not like me at all
- 41. I have overcome setbacks to conquer an important challenge.
- a) Very much like me
- b) Mostly like me
- c) Somewhat like me
- d) Not much like me
- e) Not like me at all
- 42. How important is work/life balance to you?
- a) Very important
- b) Somewhat important
- c) Slightly important
- d) Not at all important
- 43. If applicable, to what extent do you feel confident in your ability to ensure a work/life balance for yourself?
- a) Very confident
- b) Somewhat confident
- c) Slightly confident
- d) Not at all confident



44. In order of preference, which communication channels do you typically use for conveying urgent (professional) information?

a)	Email	1
b)	Phone call	2
c)	Text message	3
d)	Face-to-face meeting	4
e)	Radio communication (e.g., onboard ship/submarine)	5

45. How well is GRGB implemented at your command?

- a) More than adequate
- b) Satisfactory
- c) Inadequate

46. How well do you understand the acquisition process in the Navy?

- a) I understand it well
- b) I somewhat understand it
- c) I do not understand it
- 47. Do you know what is GRGB?
- a) Get Real Get Better
- b) Get Ready Get Brillant
- c) Get Realistic Get Better
- d) Go Rapid Go Bold



48. How familiar are you with your community values and board precepts for promotion?

- a) Very familiar
- b) Somewhat familiar
- c) Not familiar
- d) Do not know

49. Yes or No: Before this question was asked, did you know about the website www.mynavyhr.navy.mil?

- 50. If yes, how frequently have you visited this website?
- a) Daily
- b) Weekly
- c) Monthly
- d) Rarely (e.g., couple times a year)
- 51. How did you find out about it? (Skip, if no)

List source(s) here:

- 52. Which of the following learning websites are you familiar with? (Select all that apply)
- a) learning.nel.navy.mil
- b) twms.dc3n.navy.mil
- c) cool.osd.mil



- d) usnwc.edu
- e) dau.edu
- f) my.navy.mil/quick-links.html
- g) CANTRAC
- h) netc.navy.mil
- i) applocker.navy.mil
- j) navycollege.navy.mil
- k) Other
- l) None

53. If you checked at least one learning website, how did you find out about it?

List source(s) here:	

54. Yes or No: Do you know what PME is? If yes, how did you find out about it?

List source(s) here:

55. True or False: Navy PME courses are mandatory for all ranks.

56. Yes or No: Do you know how to access the Navy's Primary PME? If yes, what website is it located on?

- a) MyNavyPortal
- b) MyNavyHR



- c) Navy eLearning
- d) TWMS
- e) CANTRAC

57. Yes or No: Do you know what JPME is? If yes, how did you find out about it?

List source(s) here:

58. Which document outlines the core values and principles of the U.S. Navy?

- a) UCMJ
- b) Navy Regulations
- c) Navy Core Values Charter
- 59. Yes or No: Do you know what DMAIC is?

60. Which historical event is most considered a turning point in naval warfare?

- a) Battle of Midway
- b) Battle of Gettysburg
- c) Battle of the Bulge

61. What is typically the highest echelon in the Navy's organizational structure?

a) Echelon I


- b) Echelon II
- c) Echelon III
- d) Echelon IV
- 62. The office of the Chief of Naval Operations is part of which echelon?
- a) Echelon I
- b) Echelon II
- c) Echelon III
- d) Echelon IV

63. Which N-code(s) are responsible for training and education in the Navy?(Select all that apply)

- a) N1
- b) N3
- c) N5
- d) N7

64. How adequate was the training or education you received prior to reporting for your billet?

- a) More than adequate
- b) Satisfactory
- c) Inadequate
- d) No billet-specific training or education was provided prior to reporting



65. Yes or No or Do Not Know: Did/Does your billet assignment offer opportunities to obtain a warfare qualification and/or community-specific certificates (e.g. Joint Aviation Supply and Maintenance Material Management (JASMMM)?

66. Yes or No: Have you experienced JO development or training at your command? If yes, how would you rate the JO development training at your command?

- a) More than adequate
- b) Satisfactory
- c) Inadequate

67. Yes or No or Do Not Know: Have you completed the Primary Professional Military Education that is designed to provide a common educational baseline for JOs (CWO2 to O-4) and senior enlisted (E-7 to E-9)? If yes, when did you complete it?

- a) O-1
- b) O-2
- c) O-3
- d) O-4

68. Yes or No or Do Not Know: Do you have any Subspecialty (SSP) code or Additional Qualification Designation (AQD) in your record? If yes, to what extent were you able to utilize the SSP or AQD in a follow-on tour?

- a) Regularly
- b) Occasionally



- c) Rarely
- d) Never

69. Yes or No or Do Not Know: Have you completed JPME I? If yes, how long did it take to complete it?

- a) Few months
- b) 1 year
- c) 2 years
- d) 3 years
- e) More than 3 years

70. If yes, which service program did you complete JPME I?

List source(s) here:



THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK



APPENDIX B. EVALUATIONS

Name (Lest Pin	EPORT & COUN	בובר	INO K	ECORD (E/	- 00)		RCS BUPE	K3 1010-1
. Name (Last, Firs	t MI SUITIX)			2. Grade/Rate	5. Desig		4. 551	
ACT TAR	INACT AT/ADSW/265 6. UIC	2	7. Ship/St	ation		8. F	romotion Status	9. Date Reported
Occasion for Report	Detachment D	Detachme	ant of	.	Period of Re	port	15 To:	
0. Periodic 6. Not Observed	11. of Individual 12. R Type of Report	teporting	Senior	13. Special	20. Physic:	al Readines	s 21. Bille	t Subcategory (if any)
Report	17. Regular 1	8. Conc		19. Ops Cdr				
2. Reporting Senio	r (Last, FI MI) 23. Gr	ade	24. Desig	25. Title		26. UIC	27. SSN	
8 Command employe	nent and command achievements							
9. Primary/Collateral/	Watchstanding duties. (Enter primary	duty abl	breviation in	box.)				
or Mid-term Counseling	g Use. (When completing FITREP	30. D	ate Counse	led 31. Counselor		32.	Signature of Indiv	idual Counseled
tter 30 and 31 from co	unseling worksheet sign 32.)							
ERFORMANCE TI andards: 4.0 - Exc	RAITS: 1.0 - Below standards/no eeds most 3.0 standards; 5.0 - M	ot progr feets ov	ressing or U rerall criteri	INSAT in any one standard a and most of the specific s	1; 2.0 - Does n standards for 5	ot yet meet 0.0. Standa	t all 3.0 standards ards are not all inc	; 3.0 - Meets all 3.0 clusive.
PERFORMANCE	1.0*		2.0	3.0		4.0		5.0
TRAITS	Below Standards		gressing	Meets Standard	is	Standards	Greatly Ex	ceeds Standards
3. ROFESSIONAL	 Lacks basic professional knowledge to p effectively. 	reform	-	 Has thorough professional knowle 	edge.	~	 Recognized expert, s difficult problems. 	sought after to solve
XPERTISE: rofessional	 Cannot apply basic skills. 		~	 Competently performs both routin new tasks. 	ac and	~	 Exceptionally skilled executes innovative i 	I, develops and ideas.
nowledge, proficiency, ad qualifications.	 Fails to develop professionally or achieve timely qualifications. 		-	 Steadily improves skills, achieves qualifications. 	s timely	~	 Achieves early/highl qualifications. 	y advanced
NOB								
4.	- Actions counter to Navy's retention/reen	listment		- Positive leadership supports Navy	y's increased		 Measurably contribution 	tes to Navy's increased
OMMAND OR RGANIZATIONAL	goals. - Uninvolved with mentoring or profession	nal	-	retention goals. Active in decrea- - Actions adequately encourage/sug	sing attrition. pport		 Proactive leader/exer 	d attrition objectives. mplary mentor. Involved in
LIMATE/EQUAL PPORTUNITY:	development of subordinates.			subordinates' personal/profession	al growth.		subordinates' person professional growth/	al development leading to sustained commitment.
contributing to growth and evelopment, human	 Actions counter to good order and discip and negatively affect Command/Organiz 	line ational	~	 Demonstrates appreciation for con Navy personnel. Positive influen 	atributions of ace on Command	-	 Initiates support prog and families to achie 	grams for military, civilian, we exceptional Command an
NOB	 Demonstrates exclusionary behavior. Fai 	ils to	·	 Values differences as strengths. F 	osters atmosphere		 Organizational clima The model of achiev 	te. ement. Develops unit cohes
	value differences from cultural diversity.			of acceptance/inclusion per EO/E	.EO policy.		by valuing difference	es as strengths.
5. IILITARY BEARING/	 Consistently unsatisfactory appearance. Unsatisfactory demeanor or conduct. 			 Excellent personal appearance. Excellent demeanor or conduct. 			 Exemplary personal Exemplary represent 	appearance. ative of Navy.
HARACTER.	 Unable to meet one or more physical 		-	 Complies with physical readiness program. 	2	~	 A leader in physical 	readiness.
ppearance, conduct,	readiness standards.				alues:		Exemplifies Navy G	F COMMEMENT
ppearance, conduct, hysical fitness, adherence Navy Core Values.	readiness standards. - Fails to live up to one or more Navy Core Values: HONOR, COURAGE,		~	 Always lives up to Navy Core Va HONOR, COURAGE, COMMIT 	IMENT.	~	HUNOK, COUKAG	E, COMMITMENT.
ppearance, conduct, hysical fitness, adherence o Navy Core Values.	readiness standards. - Fails to live up to one or more Navy Core Values: HONOR, COURAGE, COMMITMENT.		~	 Always lives up to Navy Core Va HONOR, COURAGE, COMMIT 	IMENT.		HUNUK, CUUKAG	E, COMBILIALI
ppearance, conduct, hysical fitness, adherence > Navy Core Values.	readiness standards. - Fails to live up to one or more Navy Core Values: HONOR, COURAGE, COMMITMENT.		~	 Atways lives up to Navy Core Va HONOR, COURAGE, COMMIT 	IMENT.		HUNOR, COURAG	
ppearance, conduct, hysical fitness, adherence Navy Core Values. NOB	readiness standards. - Fails to live up to one or more Navy Core Values: HONOR, COURAGE, COMMITMENT. - Creates conflict, unwilling to work		- 	Always lives up to Navy Core Va HONOR, COURAGE, COMMIT Reinforces others' efforts, meets	PMENT.		 Team builder, inspir 	es cooperation and
ppearance, conduct, hysical fitness, adherence Navy Core Values. NOB 6. EAMWORK: outributions towards team	readiness standards. - Fails to live up to one or more Navy Core Values: HONOR, COURAGE, COMMITMENT. - Creates conflict, unwilling to work with others, puts self above team. - Fails to understand team goals or			Alvays lives up to Navy Core Va HONOR, COURAGE, COMMIT Reinforces others' efforts, meets commitments to learn. Understands tearn goals, employs	PMENT.	- 	Team builder, inspir progress. Talented mentor, for	es cooperation and
operatuce, coduct, nysical fitness, adherence Navy Core Values. NOB 6. EAMWORK: oatributioas towards team ilding and team results.	readiness standards. - Fails to live up to one or more Navy Core Values: HONOR, COURAGE, COMMITMENT. - Creates conflict, unwilling to work with others, puts self above team. - Fails to understand team goals or learnwork techniques. - Does not take direction well.		- - - -	Ahays lives up to Navy Core Va HONOR, COURAGE, COMMIT Beiaforces others' efforts, meets commitments to team. Understands team goals, employs teamwork techniques. Accepts and differ team direction	PMENT.	-	Team builder, inspir progress. Talented mentor, foc techniques for team. The best at accepting	es cooperation and uses goals and g and offering team
ppearauce, conduct, hysical fitness, adherence Navy Core Values. NOB 6. EAMWORK: Datributions towards team uilding and learn results.	readiness standards. - Fails to live up to one or more Navy Core Values: HONOR, COURAGE, COMMITMENT. - Creates conflict, unswilling to work with others, puts self above team. - Fails to understand team goals or teamwork techniques. - Does not take direction well.		* * *	Abays lives up to Navy Core Va HONOR, COURAGE, COMMIT Beinforces others' efforts, meets commitments to team. Understands team goals, camploys teamwork techniques. Accepts and offers team direction	personal ; good	- - - -	 Team builder, iaspir progress. Taleated meator, foc techniques for team. The best at accepting direction. 	es cooperation and
ppearance, cooduct, hysical fitness, adhereace Navy Core Values. NOB	readiness standards. - Faits to live up to one or more Navy Core Values: HONOR, COURAGE, COMMITMENT. - Creates conflict, uswilling to work with others, puts self above team. - Fails to understand team goals or teamwork techniques. - Does not take direction well.			Abays lives up to Navy Core Va HONOR, COURAGE, COMMIT Beinforces others' efforts, meets commitments to learn. Understands team goals, employs reamwork techniques. Accepts and offers team direction	persoaal ; good	- - - -	Team builder, inspir progress. Talented mentor, for techniques for team. The best at accepting direction.	es cooperation and uses goals and g and offering isam
ppearance, cooduct, hyviral fitness, adhereace Navy Core Values. NOB 6. EAMWORK: outfobutions towards team uilding and team results. NOB 7.	readiness standards. - Fails to live up to one or more Navy Core Values: HONOR, COURAGE, COMMITMENT. - Creates conflict, unwilling to work with others, puts self above team. - Fails to understand team goals or teamwork techniques. - Does not take direction well. - Lacks initiative.			Abays lives up to Navy Core Va HONOR, COURAGE, COMMIT Beinforces others' efforts, meets commitments to learn. Understands team goals, employs enarmore the team indicates. Accepts and offers team direction Takes initiative to meet souts.	persoaal ; good ,.		Team builder, inspir progress. Takened mentor, for techniques for team. The best at accepting direction.	es cooperation and uses goals and g and offering team
Persentance, conduct, pysical fitness, adherence NOB NOB 6. EAMWORK: outributions towards team wilding and team results. NOB 7. TISSION COMMENTINGENEER	readiness standards. - Fails to live up to one or more Navy Core Values: HONOR, COURAGE, COMMITMENT. - Creates conflict, unwilling to work with others, puts self above team. - Fails to understand team goals or teamwork techniques. - Does not take direction well. - Lacks initiative. - Unable to plan or prioritize.			Abays lives up to Navy Cee V3 HONOR, COURAGE, COMMIT Beiaforces others' efforts, meets commitments to learn. Understands team goals, employs enamore the thaingues. Accepts and offers team direction Takes initiative to meet goals. Plans/prioritizes effectively.	persoaal ; good ,.	- - - - - -	Team builder, inspir progress, Takeing menor team, The best at accepting direction. Develops innovative mixison. Phang/apicificum u-tik	es cooperation and uses goals and and offering team ways to accomplish
ppearauce, conduct, pysical fitness, adherence NoB NOB 6. EAMWORK: outributions towards team wilding and team results. NOB 7. IISSION CCOMPLISHMENT ND INITIATIVE: view initiative:	readiness standards. - Fails to live up to one or more Navy Core Values: HONOR, COURAGE, COMMITMENT. - Creates conflict, unwilling to work with others, puts self above team. - Fails to understand team goals or teamwork techniques. - Does not take direction well. - Lacks initiative. - Unable to plan or prioritize. - Does not minimia readiness.			Abays lives up to Navy Cee V3 HONOR, COURAGE, COMMIT HONOR, COURAGE, COMMIT Commitments to learn. Understands team goals, employs rannown techniques. Accepts and offers team direction Takes initiative to meet goals. Plans/prioritizes effectively. Maintaines thef start of readimere.	personal ; good i.	- - - - - - - - -	Team builder, inspir progress, Takeing menor team, Takeing menor team, The best at accepting direction. Develops innovative mission. Develops innovative mission. Mandyner menote menotement	es cooperation and uses goals and and offering team ways to accomplish exceptional skill princes even with
NOB	readiness standards. Fails to live up to one or more Navy Core Values: HONOR, COURAGE, COMMITMENT. Creates conflict, unwilling to work with others, puts self above team. Fails to understand team goals or teamwork techniques. Does not take direction well. Lacks initiative. Unable to plan or prioritize. Does not maintain readiness. Fails to get the job done.			Abays lives up to Nay Cœe Va HONOR, COURAGE, COMMIT HONOR, COURAGE, COMMIT Counsilination of the second seco	persoaal ; good L.	- - - - - - - -	Team builder, inspir progress, Team builder, inspir Trachaiques for team. The best at accepting direction. Develops innovative mission. The box start accepting direction. Develops innovative mission. Manufains superior re- limited resources. (cfex beh down surface)	es cooperation and uses goals and g and offering team ways to accomplish exceptional skill adiress, evce with card far better then
pyearance, conduct, pyearance, conduct, pyearance, conduct, NoB 0	readiness standards. Fails to live up to one or more Navy Core Values: HONOR, COURAGE, COMMITMENT. Creates coaffict, unwilling to work with others, puts self above team. Fails to understand team goals or teamwork techniques. Does not take direction well. Lacks initiative. Unable to plan or prioritize. Does not minimia readiness. Fails to get the job done.			Abays lives up to Nay Cœe Va HONOR, COURAGE, COMMIT HONOR, COURAGE, COMMIT commitments to team. Understands team geals, employs rannwork techniques. Accepts and offers team direction Takes initiative to meet geals. Plans/prioriti.ase effectively. Maintains high state of readiness. Aloways gets the job done.	personal i good i.	- - - - - - -	Team builder, inspir progress, Taleated mentor, for trachiques for team. The best at accepting direction. Develops innovative mission. Pland prioritizes with and forceight. Maintains superior re limited resources. Cets jobs done earliest ezgected.	es cooperation and uses goals and g and offering team ways to accomplish exceptional skill adiress, even with r and far better than

Figure 5. USN FITREP (Front). Source: MyNavyHR (n.d.e).



	i ini ounity			2	2. Grade/Rate	3. Desi	g			4. 33N		
DEDEODMANCE	1.0*		2.0		3.0		Т	4.0		5.0		
TRAITS	Below Standards	5	Pro- gressing		Meets Standards		3	Above Standard s	C	Greatly Exceed	s Standards	
38. LEADERSHIP: Organizing, motivating and developing others to accomplish goals.	 Neglects growth/development or subordinates. Fails to organize, creates problem for subordinates. Does not set or achieve goals rele to command mission and vision. Lacks ability to cope with or tole- stress. Inadequate communicator. Tolerates hazards or unsafe practi 	welfare of ns evant rate ices.		 Effectively si subordinates. Organizes su improvement Sets/achieves support com Performs wei Clear, timely Easures safet equipment. 	timulates growth/devel- ccessfully, implementia ts and efficiencies. s useful, realistic goals mand mission. 41 in stressful situations (v communicator. ty of personnel and	opment in g process that			 Inspirin subordi and dev Superb develop efficien Leader further Persev challen Excepti Makes maintai Constat profess 	g motivator and tra nates reach highest elopment. organizer, great for organizer, great for s process improven cies. thig achievements d command mission a communicator ess through the tou yes and inspires oth onal communicator ess through the tou yes and inspires step- ness step safety record uty improves the pg onal lives of others	iner, level of growth ments and framatically and vision. ghest ers. - - conscious, J. ersonal and	
NOB												
39. TACTICAL PERFORMANCE: (Warfare qualified officers only) Basic and tactical employment of weapons systems.	 Has difficulty attaining qualificant capected for rank and experience. Has difficulty in ship(s), nircraft or weapoas systems employment. Below ohters in knowledge and employment. Wardare skills in specialty are below standards compared to others of sume rank and experience. 	ions	5 5 9	 Attains qualit and expected Capably emg weapons syst warfare know Warfare kill others of sam 	fications as required L ploys ship(s), aircraft, of terms. Equal to others in wledge and employment Is in specialty equal to the rank and experience	or a t.			 Fully for rational alternation above above and en Warfa other expension 	qualified at appro- ak and experience trively employs s it, or weapons sy others in warfare apployment. ce skills in specia s of same rank an ience.	opriate level e. ship(s), rstems. Well e knowledge alty exceed ad	
NOB												
Font must be 10 or 12 p	⁴ ERFORMANCE. * All 1.0 m. itch (10 to 12 point) only. Use	acks , three 2.0 upper and low	J marks, and er case.	2.0 marks in	n Block 34 must be :	specifically s	subst	anuateo ir	i commen	s. Comments m	ust be verifiat	ole.
Font must be 10 oc 12 p	/EkFORMANCE. * All L0 m	acks , three 2.4	J marks, and	2.0 marks in	Block 34 must be :	specifically s	subst	antiateo ir	commen	s. Comments m	ust be vetifial	ote.
Promotion Recommendation	NOB Significant Pcoblems	acks , three 2.4 upper and low	Promotal	2.0 marks in	st Early Promote	44. Re	porti	ng Senior	Address	s. Comments m	ust be verifial	ole.
Promotion Recommendation 42. INDIVIDUAL	NOB Significant Problems	acks , three 2.4 upper and low	Promotal	Je Mu Prom	sst Early promote	44. Re	porti	ng Senior	Address	s. Comments m	ust be vetifial	ole.
Promotion Recommendation 42. INDIVIDUAL 43. SUMMARY	NOB Significant Problems	Progressing	Promotal	2.0 marks in ye Mu Prom	st Eacly note Promote	44. Re	porti	ng Senior	Address	s. Comments m	ust be verifial	ole,
Promotion Recommendation 42. INDIVIDUAL 43. SUMMARY 45. Signature of Report	NOB Significant Problems ing Senior	Progressing Date:	Promotal	ole Mu Prom	sst Early note Pcomote 46. Signature of peloremance, submit	44. Re individual er understand a statement	porti valua	ng Senior red. "Ih ight to ma	Address ave seen 1 ke a statead	s. Comments m bis report, been : nent.	ust be verifial	y
Promotion Recommendation 42. INDIVIDUAL 43. SUMMARY 45. Signature of Report Member Trait Averag 47. Typed name, grade	NOB Significant Problems ing Senior e: Summary (command, UIC, and signature	Progressing Progressing Group Avera	Promotal ge: porting Senie	2.0 marks in be Mu Ptom oc on Concurc	In Block 34 must be a st Early Promote 46. Signature of performance, and 1 intend to submit ent Report	44. Re individual ev uudetstand a statement	porti	ng Senior red. *11 ight to m	Address ave seen i ake a state	his report, been nent." to submit a stater Date:	apprised of m ment	y]
Promotion Recommendation 42. INDIVIDUAL 43. SUMMARY 45. Signature of Report Member Trait Averag 47. Typed name, grade	NOB Significant NOB Significant Problems ing Senior e: Summary - command, UIC, and signature	Progressing Progressing Group Avera of Regular Re	Promotal Promotal ge: pocting Senio	ole Mu Prom	In Block 34 must be a start of the start of	44. Re individual ev understand a statement	porti	ng Senior	Address ave seen ke a state	s. Comments m his report, been nent." Date: Date:	apprised of m	y]

Figure 6. USN FITREP (Back). Source: MyNavyHR (n.d.e).



	os of the U.S. Public Health Services Commission	ce ed Office	rs' Effectiveness Repor	t
	001111331011			• • • • • • •
SECTION 1. ADMI	NISTRATIVE DATA: Required			
PARTI, OFFICER		ON.		
a. Name and Rank of I	Rated Officer (Rank, Last, First, MI):		b. Period Covered by Report (N	/M/DD/YY):
			From	То
c. Type of Report (Ch	eck only one): Annual Inter	rim	Purpose	
d. HHS Division or Nor	-HHS Organization for Report Period	d:	e. Position/Billet Title for Report	Period:
. Position/Billet Grade	for Report Period (check highest):		g. In current billet since (MM/DE	D/YY):
		-/ <u> </u> 0-8		
A Name and Rank of I	Rater (Rank Last First ML Title)	-	h Phone Number	c Email Address
2. Herne and Harik Uli	$\mathbf{x}_{\mathbf{x}_{\mathbf{x}_{\mathbf{y}_{\mathbf{y}_{\mathbf{y}_{\mathbf{y}_{\mathbf{y}_{\mathbf{x}_{\mathbf{y}_{\mathbf{y}_{\mathbf{x}_{\mathbf{x}_{\mathbf{y}_{\mathbf{x}_{\mathbf{y}_{\mathbf{x}_{\mathbf{y}_{\mathbf{x}_{\mathbf{y}_{\mathbf{x}_{\mathbf{y}_{\mathbf{x}_{\mathbf{y}_{\mathbf{x}_{\mathbf{y}_{\mathbf{x}_{\mathbf{y}_{\mathbf{x}_{\mathbf{y}_{\mathbf{x}_{\mathbf{y}_{\mathbf{x}_{\mathbf{y}_{\mathbf{x}_{\mathbf{y}_{\mathbf{x}_{\mathbf{y}_{\mathbf{x}_{\mathbf{y}_{\mathbf{x}_{\mathbf{y}_{\mathbf{x}_{\mathbf{y}_{\mathbf{x}_{\mathbf{y}_{\mathbf{x}_{\mathbf{x}_{\mathbf{y}_{\mathbf{x}_{\mathbf{x}_{\mathbf{y}_{\mathbf{x}_{\mathbf{x}_{\mathbf{y}_{\mathbf{x}_{\mathbf{x}_{\mathbf{y}_{\mathbf{x}_{\mathbf{x}_{\mathbf{y}_{\mathbf{x}_{\mathbf{x}_{\mathbf{y}}}}}}}}}}}}}}}}}}}}}}}}}}}}}}}}}}$			c, Email Address.
d. Time supervising thi	s officer	e. Please ra	te the officer's overall performance	e of job duties during the report period.
Years	Months	Satisf	actory 🔲 Marginal 🔲 Unsatis	factory
Strengths: List the a	reas in which the officer displays stro	ong qualities a	nd superior skills. (3 lines = 240 C	ourier New 10 pt. characters)
n. Signature / Date	FEICER'S SIGNATURE and CO	NCURREN		
a. Select one option.	I concur with this evaluation.	DROOMALM	OL / HON-OONOONALHOL.	
	I disagree with this evaluation.	Comments ma	ay be submitted through your Com	missioned Corps Liaison.
o. Signature / Date	I have read this review and have ha	ad the opportu	unity to discuss it.	
		SIGNATUR		
a. Name of Reviewing	Official (Rank, Last, First, MI, Title):	GIGHATON	b. Phone Number:	c. Email Address:
			2 11 EON ED EON	
	I concur with this evaluation			
d. Select one option.		onable this r	ater is somewhat more demanding	than average.
d. Select one option.	Although this evaluation is reas	onabio, and re		
d. Select one option.	Although this evaluation is reas	sonable, this ra	ater is somewhat less demanding	than average.
d. Select one option,	Although this evaluation is reas Although this evaluation is reas I disagree with this evaluation.	sonable, this ra	ater is somewhat less demanding	than average,
d. Select one option. e. Reviewing Official's	Although this evaluation is reas Although this evaluation is reas I disagree with this evaluation. Comments.	sonable, this ra	ater is somewhat less demanding	than average.
d. Select one option. e. Reviewing Official's	Although this evaluation is reas Although this evaluation is reas I disagree with this evaluation. Comments.	sonable, this ra	ater is somewhat less demanding	than average,
d. Select one option. e. Reviewing Official's	Although this evaluation is reas Although this evaluation is reas I disagree with this evaluation. Comments.	sonable, this ra	ater is somewhat less demanding	than average.
d. Select one option. e. Reviewing Official's	Although this evaluation is reas Although this evaluation is reas I disagree with this evaluation. Comments.	sonable, this ra	ater is somewhat less demanding	than average,
d. Select one option. e. Reviewing Official's f. Signature / Date	Although this evaluation is reas	sonable, this ra	ater is somewhat less demanding	than average,

Figure 7. USPHS Report p.1. Source: Commissioned Corps of the U.S. Public Health Service. (n.d.b.)



Department of Health and Commissioned Corps of th	Human Services e U.S. Public Health Service	
	Commissioned Officers' Effectiveness Report (cont	
SECTION 2: OFFICER'S	COMMENTS: To Be Completed by Officer.	ed. Use the space provided
OFFICER INSTRUCTION	5. Describe your duites, goals and accomplishments during the performance per	ou. Ose the space provided.
Description. Describe the m	ain duties and responsibilities in your job during the performance period.	
Goals. List your work-related	goals for the next performance period and long term career goals.	
Accomplishments. List you	r accomplishments related to the elements you will be rated on in section 3.	
PHS-838 (Rev. 09/2021)		Page 2 of 6

Figure 8. USPHS Report p.2. Source: Commissioned Corps of the U.S. Public Health Service. (n.d.b.)



Department of Health and Human Se Commissioned Corps of the U.S. Pub Co	vices lic Health S ommissi	Service oned Officers' Effectiveness	Repo	Officer's SERNO
SECTION 3: PERFORMANCE EVAI ATER INSTRUCTIONS: Rate the off comments are required. Describe the act ctions and your rating.	UATION: cer in relation cle per elem on(s) upon v	To Be Completed by the Rater. Option: on to the needs of the position as follows: ent. To assist you, guidance for marginal, which you based your rating. Be specific a	al if per 1 = Uns satisfac to that th	icd of supervision is less than 6 months. atisfactory range; 2 to 3 = Marginal range; 4 to dory and exceptional performance is presented. here is a clear connection between the Officer's
. Leadership - Demonstrates and commission.	nunicates vis	sion and sense of purpose; nurtures an en	vironme	nt conducive to accomplishing the organization's
- Demonstrates behavior that maintains the status quo, often seeking direction in accomplishing the team's goals. - Has minimal influence on others.		Demonstrates behavior that facilitates Diaboration, fairness, and inclusiveness. Influences others through actions, ccomplishments, and team work.		Consistently demonstrates behavior that contributes to the organization's success by fostering effective relationships, inspiring the trust of others, and nurturing group effectiveness and cohesion. Influences others by exhibiting vision, innovation, resilience, inclusiveness, and by teaching and coaching others.
. Initiative and Growth - Recognizes an	d acts on pr	ogrammatic and personal developmental i	needs, r	esulting in advancement of programmatic goals
Needs assistance in identifying opportunities to improve work performance. Work performance improves with regular supervisory input and detailed instructions about assignments. Needs guidance to understand ho personal decisions and actions contribute to mistakes or impedes success of individual and group projects.	v ui	Recognizes opportunities for growth and seks experiences to improve work erformance. Willingly incorporates new approaches nd responsibilities to advance program cals. Requires minimal supervision and seks guidance with solutions only for nexpected barriers. Accepts responsibility for personal acisions or mistakes and learns from mors.	0	Independently seeks out and completes challenging opportunities that broaden expertise, maximize job performance, and enhance value to the program. Anticipates program needs including potential barriers. Proactively and decisively implements innovative solutions to improve work processes with impact beyond scope of assigned responsibilities. Actively identifies personal role in a problem and contributes to the solution, enhancing the successful outcome of individual and argun projects
Comments:				individual and group projects.

PHS-838 (Rev. 09/2021)

Page 3 of 6

Figure 9. USPHS Report p.3. Source: Commissioned Corps of the U.S. Public Health Service. (n.d.b.)





PHS-838 (Rev. 09/2021)

Page 4 of 6

Figure 10. USPHS Report p.4. Source: Commissioned Corps of the U.S. Public Health Service. (n.d.b.)



	e U.S. Public Health Service Commissioned C	officers' Effectiveness Re	port (cont)
6. Professional Competencie	es - Demonstrates knowledge, s	kills, and abilities to function success	ully in the position.
Basic knowledge of sub required for assigned dut demonstrates average at and apply specialized kno - Seeks assistance in und issues, concepts, and situ affect job performance. - Needs supervisory assis ensure quality work produ	ject matter ies; Dility to learn owledge. lerstanding uations which stance to ucts. Unit of subject owledge. lerstanding concept lessons producti - Demor of subject operatio - Clear L concept lessons producti - Cuality - Clear L concept lessons which	strates in depth knowledge ts required by assigned sy rewed as a competent and authority on specialty or nal issues. Inderstanding of issues, s and situations and applies learned to improve individual vity. of work is commensurate ear's rank	Exhibits great depth and breadth of knowledge of multiple subjects; is viewed by others within and outside immediate office as a subject matter expert. Excellent grasp of complex issues, concepts and situations, and applies lessons learned to improve individual and organizational productivity. Consistently produces work of exceptional quality.
7. Analysis, Judgment and D	Decision-Making - Identifies and	considers information in order to rea	ch sound conclusions and take appropriate actions

PHS-838 (Rev. 09/2021)

Comments:

- An adequately performing Officer with some potential to accept increased responsibilities and for professional growth.

Page 5 of 6

- A distinguished Officer, recognized for expertise with impact extending beyond assigned position; serves as a role model for others in the program.

Figure 11. USPHS Report p.5. Source: Commissioned Corps of the U.S. Public Health Service. (n.d.b.)

- A very competent Officer making significant contributions that enhance the assigned position, respected by peers; good potential for continued growth and development.

8. Overall Effectiveness - Synthesis of Officer's performance, and impact on program in current position.



Attachments Menu								
COMPANY GRADE PLATE	E (01 - 03; WO1 - 0	W2) OFFIC	ER EVAL	UATION F	REPORT	See l Stateme	Privacy Act nt in AR 623-3.	
PART I - ADMINISTRATIVE (Rated Officer)								
a. NAME (Last. First, Middle Initial)	1 AN	b. SSN (or D	OD ID No.)	C RANK	d DATE OF		NCH & COMPONENT	
,			,	G. IVIIII	(YYYYMMA	DD)	(Status Code)	
A LINIT ORG STATION ZID CODE OR	ARO MAJOR COMMAND			h UIC		ON FOR SUBM	NOISSIN	
g. onn, one, shanon, zir cobe on					L HERE			
J. PERIOD COVERED	K. RATED I. NON R	ATED m. NO	OF	n. RATED OF	FICER'S EMAIL ADD	RESS (.gov or .	.mil)	
FROM (YYYYMMDD) THRU (YYYYMMD	D) MONTHS CODES	5 EN	CLOSURES					
PART II - AUTHENTICATION	(Rated officer's signature	e verifies officer	has seen o	completed OF	R Parts I-VI and the	e administrativ	e data is correct)	
a1. NAME OF RATER (Last, First, Middle I	nttal)		a2. 88N (0	r DOD ID No.)	a3. RANK	a4. POSITIO	N	
a5. EMAIL ADDRESS (.gov or .mil)			a6. RATE	RSIGNATURE			a7. DATE (YYYYMMOD)	
b1. NAME OF INTERMEDIATE RATER (L	ast, First, Middle Initial)		b2. SSN (0	r DOD ID No.)	b3. RANK	64. POSITIO	N	
						1		
b5. EMAIL ADDRESS (.gov or .mll)			b6. INTER	MEDIATE RAT	ER SIGNATURE		b7. DATE (YYYYMMDD)	
C1. NAME OF SENIOR RATER (Last, First	, Middle Initial)		c2. 88N (0	r DOD ID No.)	c3. RANK	c4. POSITIO	N	
				,]		
c5. SENIOR RATER'S ORGANIZATION	c6. BRANCH c7. COMPC	NENT V	c9. EMAIL	ADDRESS (.g	ov or .mil)			
	c8. SENIOR RATER PHO	NE NUMBER	c10. SENI	OR RATER SIG	SNATURE		c11. DATE (YYYYMMDD)	
			Mar AN					
d. This is a referred report, do you wish to r Referred Yes,	nake comments? comments are attached	No	e1. RATED OFFICER SIGNATURE e2. DATE (YY)					
f1. Supplementary Review Required?	Yes No		12. NAME OF REVIEWER (Last, First, Middle Initial)					
13. RANK	14. POSITION		15. Comments Enclosed					
16. SUPPLEMENTARY REVIEWER SIGNA	TURE 17. DAT	re (Yyyymmdd)	1					
		PART III - DU	TY DESCR	IPTION				
a. PRINCIPAL DUTY TITLE			b. POSIT	ION AOC/BRAI	NCH			
6. SIGNIFICANT DUTIES AND RESPONS	BILMES							
DADT IV. DED	C. SIGNIFICANT DUTIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES							
PART IV - PER	FORMANCE EVALUATI	UN - PROFESS	Helebi	, COMPETE	NULES, AND ATTR	IBUIES (Rate	er)	
Comments regulared for "Failed" APET or	"Profile" when it precludes n	erformance of du	ty, and "No" !	for Army Weight	t Standards? Reset I	tem a. APFT/Pa	In Standard?	
b. This Officer's overall Performance is Rat your career. Managed at less than 50%	ed as: (Select one box repre- In EXCELS.)	senting Rated Off	icer's overall	performance co	ompared to others of t	he same grade v	whom you have rated in	
I currently rate Army Officers In A completed DA Form 67-10-1A was rece EXCELS (49%)	h this grade. Elved with this report and con PROFICIENT	sidered in my eva	aluation and r	eview: Ye	s 📃 No (explain in o TORY	comments below	0	
Comments								
a a construction of the								
DA FORM 67-10-1, MAR 2019							Page 1 of 2 APD LC v1.00E	





HQDA#:					
NAME:		SSN (or DOD ID No.)	PERIOD COVERED:	FROM (YYYYMMDD)	THRU (YYYYMMDD)
c. 1) <u>Character:</u> (Adherence to Army Values, Empathy, and Warrior Ethos/ Service Ethos and Discipline. Fully supports ShARP, EO, and EEO.)		<u> </u>			
c. 2) <u>Presence</u> : (Mittary and Professional Bearing, Fitness, Confident, Resilient)					
c. 3) <u>Intellact:</u> (Nental Aglity, Sound Judgment, Innovation, Interpersonal Tact, Expertise)					
c. 4) Leads: (Leads Others, Builds Trust, Extends Influence beyond the Chain of Command, Leads by Example, Communicates)					
c. 5) <u>Developa:</u> (Creates a positive command/ workplace environment/Posters Esprit de Corps, Prepares Self, Develops Others, Stewards the Profession/					
c. 6) <u>Achieves</u> ; (Gets Results)					
	PART	V - INTERMEDIATE RATER	1		
	PA	RT VI - SENIOR RATER			
OFFICERS SENIOR RATED IN SAME GRADE (OVERPRINTED BY DA)	b. I currently senior rate	Army Officers in this grade	2.		
MOST QUALIFIED (limited to 40%)					
HIGHLY QUALIFIED					
QUALIFIED					
NOT QUALIFIED					
	d. List 3 future <u>SUCCESSIVE</u>	assignments for which this Office	er is dest suffed:		
DA FORM 67-10-1, MAR 2019					Page 2 of 2
					APD LC v1.00ES

Figure 13. Army Officer Evaluation Report p.2. Source: Army Publishing Directorate. (n.d.a.)



THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK



LIST OF REFERENCES

- Ahn, S. Y., & Hartmann, L. (2022). *Performance evaluation needs assessment* (NPS-DDM-22-004). Naval Postgraduate School. https://hdl.handle.net/10945/71058
- Army Publishing Directorate. (n.d.). DA form: Record details for DA form 67–10-1A. Retrieved August 13, 2024 from https://armypubs.army.mil/ProductMaps/ PubForm/Details.aspx?PUB_ID=1007032
- Birkemalm, P., & Jansson, S. (2018). Entrepreneurs vs. Intrapreneurs: A comparative study about motivation factors of entrepreneurs and intrapreneurs (Dissertation). Umea School of Business, Economics and Statistics. https://umu.diva-portal.org/ smash/record.jsf?pid=diva2%3A1224155&dswid=3249
- Bloom, B. S. (1956). Taxonomy of educational objectives. David McKay
- Clausewitz, C. (1976). *On war*. (M. Howard & P. Paret, Eds. & Trans.). Princeton University Press.
- Commissioned Corps of the U.S. Public Health Service. (n.d.). Commissioned officers' effectiveness report. Retrieved August 27, 2024, from https://dcp.psc.gov/ CCMIS/PDF_docs/PHS-838%20(updated).pdf
- Defense Innovation Board (2024). Aligning *incentives to drive faster tech adoption*. https://innovation.defense.gov/Portals/63/20240701%20DIB% 20Report_Aligning%20Incentives%20PUBLISHED%20STUDY.pdf
- Department of the Army. (2019). *Mission command: Command and control of Army forces* (ADP 6–0). https://armypubs.army.mil/epubs/DR_pubs/DR_a/ARN34403-ADP_6-0-000-WEB-3.pdf
- Department of Defense (2020). Major capability acquisition. (DoD Instruction 5000.85).
- Department of the Navy (2022, October 13). *Get real get better*. https://www.navy.mil/ Resources/Blogs/Detail/Article/2894808/get-real-get-better/
- Joint Chiefs of Staff. (2020). Developing today's joint officers for tomorrow's ways of war. https://www.jcs.mil/Portals/36/Documents/Doctrine/education/ jcs_pme_tm_vision.pdf
- Joint Chiefs of Staff. (2024). Officer professional military education policy (CJCSI 1800.01G). https://www.jcs.mil/Library/CJCS-Instructions/
- Kime, P. (2019, January 15). *Navy to embrace "mission command" concepts to match adversaries*. Military.com. https://www.military.com/daily-news/2019/01/15/ navy-embrace-mission-command-concepts-match-adversaries.html



- Macrae, N. (1982, April 17). *Intrapreneurial now*. The Economist. https://web.archive.org/web/20110920045625/http://www.intrapreneur.com:80/ MainPages/History/Economist.html
- Miller, D. (1983). The correlates of entrepreneurship in three types of firms. *Management Science*, *29*(7), 770–791. https://pubsonline.informs.org/doi/abs/10.1287/mnsc.29.7.770
- MyNavyHR (n.d.a). *MyNavy coaching*. Retrieved August 27, 2024, from https://www.mynavyhr.navy.mil/Career-Management/Talent-Management/ Coaching/
- MyNavyHR (n.d.b). *Navy Leadership Assessment Program (NLAP)*. Retrieved August 27, 2024, from https://www.mynavyhr.navy.mil/Career-Management/Talent-Management/NLAP/
- MyNavyHR (n.d.c). *Performance Evaluation Transformation (PET)*. Retrieved August 27, 2024, from https://www.mynavyhr.navy.mil/Career-Management/Talent-Management/PET/
- MyNavyHR (n.d.d). *Talent management*. Retrieved August 27, 2024, from https://www.mynavyhr.navy.mil/Career-Management/Talent-Management/
- Pinchot, G., & Pellman, R. (1999). *Intrapreneuring in action: A handbook for business innovation*. Berrett-Koehler Publishers.
- Pinchot, G., & Pinchot, E. (1978). *Intra-corporate entrepreneurship*. https://web.archive.org/web/20110713050351/http://www.intrapreneur.com/Main
- Sharpe, J., & Creviston, T. (2015, April 30). *Understanding mission command*. U.S. Army. https://www.army.mil/article/106872/understanding_mission_command
- Shenk, R. (1997). The Naval Institute guide to naval writing. Naval Institute Press.





Acquisition Research Program Naval Postgraduate School 555 Dyer Road, Ingersoll Hall Monterey, CA 93943

WWW.ACQUISITIONRESEARCH.NET