

**THE EIGHTEENTH HUGH J. CLAUSEN LECTURE IN
LEADERSHIP***

BRIGADIER GENERAL TOM KOLDITZ¹

* This is an edited transcript of a lecture delivered by Brigadier General (Retired) Kolditz to members of the staff and faculty, their distinguished guests, and officers attending the 61st Judge Advocate Officer Graduate Course at The Judge Advocate General's School, Charlottesville, Virginia, on October 15, 2012.

The Clausen Lecture is named in honor of Major General Hugh J. Clausen, who served as The Judge Advocate General, U.S. Army, from 1981 to 1985 and served over thirty years in the U.S. Army before retiring in 1985. His distinguished military career included assignments as the Executive Officer of The Judge Advocate General; Staff Judge Advocate, III Corps and Fort Hood; Commander, U.S. Army Legal Services Agency and Chief Judge, U.S. Army Court of Military Review; The Assistant Judge Advocate General; and finally, The Judge Advocate General. After his retirement from active duty, General Clausen served for a number of years as the Vice President for Administration and Secretary to the Board of Visitors at Clemson University.

¹ Tom Kolditz is Professor in the Practice of Leadership and Management and Director of the Leadership Development Program at the Yale School of Management. His experience as a leader development expert spans four decades in the public, private, and social sectors.

A retired brigadier general and titled Professor Emeritus by the U.S. Military Academy, General Kolditz led the Department of Behavioral Sciences and Leadership at West Point for twelve years. In that role, he was responsible for teaching, research, and outreach activities in Management, Leader Development Science, Psychology, and Sociology. A highly experienced global leader, General Kolditz has served more than twenty-six years in leader roles on four continents. His career has focused on either leading organizations himself or studying leadership and leadership policy across sectors. He served for two years as a leadership and human resources policy analyst in the Pentagon, and a year as a concept developer in the Center for Army Leadership. General Kolditz was the founding director of the Thayer Leader Development Group, and is the managing member of Saxon Castle LLC, a leader development consultancy.

General Kolditz is an internationally recognized expert on crisis leadership and leadership in extreme contexts, and in the development of programs to inculcate leadership and leader development in everything from project teams to large organizations. He has published extensively across a diverse array of academic and leadership trade journals, and serves on the editorial and advisory boards of several academic journals. He is a Fellow in the American Psychological Association and is a member of the Academy of Management. He is a founding member of the Board of Advisors for the Department of Psychology at the University of Missouri, on the Council of Senior Advisors for the Future of Executive Development Forum, and is an Academic in Residence for the Global Leadership Strategy Network. His consultancies include Google and GE.

A skydiving instructor since 1980, Kolditz weaves his personal experiences and abilities as a Soldier, skydiver, and scholar into the first-hand study, analysis, and practice of leadership in dangerous circumstances—*in extremis* leadership—and how such leadership can inform the practice of leading in more ordinary settings. His most recent book, *In Extremis Leadership: Leading as if Your Life Depended on It*, was based on more than 175 interviews taken on the ground in Iraq during combat operations. He

Well, thank you so much, General Darpino, for that incredible introduction and what an honor it is for me to come here and be able to talk to you all a little bit about leadership. It's something that has always touched me and it's been the focus of my entire career.

But before I get started talking about leadership, I'd just like to talk to you a little bit about what people like you have done for me and for my career, because quite frankly I would not have gotten off the ground in the Army without an association with Army lawyers. And then going forward I really saw Army lawyers as sort of Vanguards of innovation for me in the jobs that I had. Because moving an organization forward and trying new things, means you get pretty close to the [ethical] line, , and when you do, you need a lawyer there.

But, first, I'd just like to try to describe to you how impactful this has been. I started my career at Fort Sill, Oklahoma, in the Officer Basic Course. And I was coming there out of the first four years of undergraduate at Vanderbilt and then four years in graduate school in psychology. And so you can imagine when I got there I found the place perhaps not quite as enlightened [laughter] as some of the places I had been. But luckily for me—and I was in a late summer course because I had this oddball career progression. Luckily for me there were other first lieutenants in the course as well and they were Army lawyers. They were Army lawyers who were going to do artillery for a little bit and then get started on their legal careers. They were an absolute font of sanity and wit and we were inseparable. Two of them I remember in particular.

has been named as a leadership Thought Leader by the Leader Institute and as a Top Leader Development Professional by Leadership Excellence.

General Kolditz has presented leadership content to more than 150 governmental, corporate, and social sector audiences worldwide. As a professor, he has led academic seminars and given lectures to students from Babson, Wellesley, and Olin Colleges, the University of Missouri, Columbia University, Duke University, Yale University, the Military Psychology Center of the Israel Defense Forces, Peking University, the Beijing International MBA program, and Harvard's Center for Public Leadership. Kolditz has appeared on *ABC World News*, *ABC 20/20*, *al Jazeera*, MSNBC, CBS, NPR, Calgary Today, Morning Ireland, and interviews with reporters from the *New York Times*, the *Chronicle of Higher Education*, the *Associated Press*, *Time*, *Discovery*, the *Atlanta Journal Constitution*, the *Washington Post*, *La Razón*, and more than a dozen national and international news agencies.

He holds many degrees, including a Bachelor's degree in Psychology and Sociology from Vanderbilt University, as well as Masters and Ph.D. degrees in Social Psychology, a Master of Military Arts and Science, and a Master in Strategic Studies.

One of them is named Keith Sickendick who later went on to be a judge in Kansas City; And the other was a guy named Karl Goetzke [laughter].

And so if you can imagine going through manual gunnery with these brilliant people who could not do math [laughter] and finding that the Army is literally, or figuratively at least, a zombie apocalypse of conventional thinking, they were the defenders. And then, fast-forward to preparing for battalion command in the middle 1990s. I was getting ready to go take a battalion in Korea, and I came here to the Senior Officer Legal Orientation. The class was mostly full of colonels, but I was working for the DCSPER (ACS G-1) at the time and talked them into sending me. It was hugely eye-opening for me en route to command. And it was not because the lawyers who taught me imposed a lot of restrictions or described things, as they needed to be. It's because as I listened to them speak and in the spirit of their instruction they taught me about what I *could* do. They taught me about what commanders could do and how we could get the job done. Without the course, my command would have been much different. I just cannot even imagine having commanded without having some degree of legal background and education. I got it here and it was just a great experience at the time. Because that is what defends you when you are up against the zombies, you know, on a daily basis [laughter]. Later I discovered, though, that they were all over. I remember I went to do a briefing on artillery in Korea—and Korea is different—how many of you have been to Korea? So you know that everything in Korea is a little bit different and artillery tactics are as well. There was a need for a really special solution in order to deliver the volume of fires in the tightly compressed area that was required by the mission. Army doctrine would not get us there this day. There was no doctrinal way of doing what we wanted to do. So we worked really hard and figured it out. We figured out how to put about 360 rounds of 155 millimeter artillery in a 300 by 300 box in eighteen minutes. And it was a really powerful technique.

I was briefing a new division commander on the procedure, and we had a unique term for it, for that particular type of fire mission. And after he listened to us he said, "Use the doctrinal term." And I told him, "Well, sir, because of what we have to do here, there really is not a doctrinal solution. And so we figured this thing out in order to get this job done." And he looked at me and he said, "Use the doctrinal term." [laughter] And I thought, "Oh, my God, the division commander is a zombie." [laughter]. Innovation and change is not always welcome

where you are. And so when you are doing innovative things, it's always really handy to have a lawyer with you.

As soon as I got to West Point, which is like most educational institutions in the military—it is a great place to try new things and to innovate and to write and to do things—it seems like I was in and out of the SJA's office all of the time. The first important thing that we were able to accomplish was to open up on publishing a little bit. I worked very closely with a JAG officer named Sarah Holland. Sarah helped me figure out how to get visibility for a book I published on leadership in dangerous contexts. We called it *In Extremis Leadership*.

We had to get this book visible enough so that other people would start doing research in this area. I was very disappointed in the amount of leadership knowledge we had about leading in dangerous places. It was mostly just kind of history and war stories and things like that. And the war had begun in Iraq in earnest and it was pretty clear that all of our graduates were going to go out and they were going to lead people in dangerous contexts. So I wanted a lot of research done on that and it was far too much for us to do in our department at West Point. So the idea was to jumpstart this research nationwide or even worldwide. And in order to do that we had to get out and speak about it, we had to travel, we had to have a marketing company push this out into the public view, and as you might imagine, there were a lot of ways to get crossways with the Joint Ethics Regulation when you are trying to do gain visibility. But the stakes were pretty high.

And so really, Sarah was the one who helped figure that out. I mean, I went to seven countries and spoke at other service academies. Most of the marketing support was from John Wiley & Sons. In the end, we stayed legal and got the visibility that helped our cause. If you go to Google "scholar" now, and you type in "In Extremis Leadership," there are over 90 articles out there, three books, and six doctoral dissertations. People now study leadership in dangerous contexts and they are not Army people. They are scholars all over the world: Norway, Israel. So now there is a body of knowledge developing around what soldiers do. That was the point of writing that book and none of that would have happened without an Army lawyer's help; none of it. The work included an article published in a journal called *Leader to Leader*. And that journal, that year, won the best magazine or journal in the United States and it was a huge feather in West Point's cap. Once again we were

stymied as to how to do that legally and in line with the regulations, but Army JAGs were able to figure it out for us.

It got into things that were even more unusual. One of the things I did at West Point, for 11 years, was coach the parachute team. We wanted a tandem program. But as you might expect, even in a military organization the ability to strap people to your chest and run out of the back of an airplane is something that the commander takes interest in. I mean, [laughter] you know, he wants to know how exposed he might be in particular, because in order to do what that team does, we used civilian aircraft; jumped at civilian drop zones; consulted civilian coaches; competed with civilian competitors. It created this complexity that challenged us, but the SJA at the time really worked with us to develop a tandem SOP for the Military Academy. We celebrated the completion of the project by my strapping the SJA, who was [COL] Robin Swope, to my chest [laughter] and running out the back of an airplane with her. That's as close as I have ever been to one of my lawyers [laughter]. But, you know, it was a lot of fun and made skydiving safer at West Point. It could not have been done without Army JAG.

We explored various kinds of corporate connections while we were at West Point. Most schools—business schools, like the one I am at right now, are incredibly well connected to business, with other leaders, with other organizations. And that is more difficult when you are in the Army to do that in the ethical way and to do it in a way that you can survive. But Lori Doughty and others helped us work in ways of making those connections proper and effective for our management program. And it resulted in some interface with corporations. And a week ago, West Point completed its first Cadet Leadership Conference sponsored by a \$2.5 million endowment from [Procter & Gamble CEO] Bob McDonald. He is a West Point graduate, but he was introduced to the department and to leadership instruction there through the kind of program Lori helped us design. We also were able to stand up the West Point Leadership Center—an endowed center run through the West Point Association of Graduates. As you know, the role of an Army officer in interfacing with organizations that might donate to a place like a West Point is really complex. It all has to happen through the Association of Graduates, with legal review by Army JAGs.

A military person can never make a request or propose a gift coming from a person, but what we can do is articulate Academy needs and describe what is important to us in the accomplishment of our mission at

West Point. To figure that out, I took a couple thousand dollars of my own money, went on leave to Indiana University, and took a course on nonprofit fundraising. Armed with that knowledge, I was able to figure out (based on my discussions with the JAG officers) what we could or could not do. Working cautiously and deliberately, in two years we were able to get \$5.5 million in direct donations and a \$10 million testamentary gift for the Leadership Center. It is now driving that center and gives it a consistent funding stream. And we in the department were able to do that all without going to jail because of our [laughter]—because of our close association, really daily, with JAG officers.

It is pretty clear in my own mind that many of the innovations that I was able to pursue, many of the things that I wanted to do in my career, would not have gotten off the ground without Army lawyers. And so as your speaker, the first expression that I wanted to give to you all here is just gratitude. Thank you so much for being out there. I appreciate the wisdom that you all bring, not only when I was in command and running a department at West Point, but at other times. To do these things right is really, really important. For those of us who work in leadership, to be on the wrong side of an ethics line or certainly of the law, would be horrifying. But at the same time, unless we go up to that line sometimes, we fall short of our capability. So thank you for that. Thank you for that very much.

Let's turn to leader development. I'm going to begin by just talking about leader development in general terms, and then I'll talk about a specific way of getting it done. The program that I'm going to discuss, the way of approaching leader development, it seems to me could have a high degree of utility for all of you. You have a bright and capable group of people that you work with and work for. You have not only an academic foundation in education, but you are also engaged in practical activity in the Army. It turns out to be a really rich environment in order to accomplish leader development. But unfortunately, at least in my experience, people tend to go about it backwards. They do it in the wrong way. So I just want to be able to make you think a little bit about leader development. And that's what professors get paid to do. We get paid to make people think. And so we're going to start off with that.

The first question for me to answer is, "can this stuff be taught?" I mean, what makes us think that it is worth putting resources and time behind leader development in our organizations? And it comes down to whether leaders are born or made. And I get asked that question a lot. It

is not an issue on which we have to speculate. There's actually been very good research done on heritability of leadership traits and leadership factors. The best research on that was done at the University of Minnesota and using identical twins that were separated at birth. Due to circumstances, they were raised in different households and different environments, but with identical genetics. As it turns out, heritability is about 31% of an individual's capacity to lead. So the answer to whether leaders are born or made is, well, partly, it's like 30% "born." It's a pretty fundamental 30%.

What do you inherit that makes you more likely to be a good leader? Well, how about intelligence? Anybody want to follow a dumb leader? [Laughter]. Of course not. So intelligence is a heavy heritability factor, part of the leadership equation. Physical attractiveness, as it turns out, if you're better looking it's easier for you to lead. And I can see that the personnel who determine who is going to be a JAG or not is already way ahead on that, because everybody out here [laughter] is good-looking. Being tall helps. It's funny, especially in American business, being tall has a heritability factor; makes it easier for an individual to lead. Not true in all cultures, but in American business culture, it is. And is that ever silly but it's just the way it is.

So if that's the news, if 30% is inherited, does that mean we really have to select people on that basis? My argument is no. I would say that everyone in this room is smart enough; everyone in this room is good-looking enough. But what that means is about 70% of leadership capacity is not inherited. Seventy percent is learned behavior that is developed environmentally. That's the part that we can work on.

So in that respect it does make sense to pursue leader development. So with that as a backdrop, then, how do people learn to lead? There is a strong body of research on how people learn to lead. About 10% of it comes from classroom activities, studying, reading. About 20% is feedback and coaching, and 70% is doing it. Seventy percent is experience. Seventy percent is running organizations, leading, and maybe failing at it a little bit. It's coaching your kid's T-ball team, leading them, and then being unsure as to why they are all crying [laughter] when you're such a great leader. And they are supposed to learn from failure, but then ice cream is a solution, obviously. But remember: 70% learned. So with that as a backdrop, let us think a little bit about how leadership is usually taught. And I certainly discovered this when I went to Yale. Leadership at Yale was classroom instruction

followed by group discussion. But that fits into only 10% of how people learn. So there has to be a better way.

The best leader development programs start by asking what causes people to develop at all. And when I say develop, I really do mean change the way they are thinking in a progressive and sequential way as they pass through their adult years. It means that you take people's experience and you enhance it using two things: new knowledge, which can be that 10% piece; and reflection. And that has some similarities to coaching, getting people to think about their experience in relation to that new knowledge. Do that over time not on a sixteen-hour offsite, but over a number of years it causes people to advance in their development. People will be better leaders in the end. Unfortunately, that is not how many institutions approach leadership or leadership development; usually it is much more academic.

I want to talk now about what we are doing at Yale and how this might look when it is applied to an academic setting. What you see on the top half of this chart, is the first-year progression of an MBA student.² There are about 290 per class at the Yale School of Management; most of them have been out in business six to ten years. They have GMAT scores in the mid-700s and they come to Yale to become business leaders. Some of them are running their own businesses while they are in business school. Many of them have nonprofits that they've founded and that are up and running; it's a busy place.

In the first year, everything you see in pink is part of a core curriculum that you would see at most every business school. A course on careers and career progression, a course on managing groups and teams, and courses on negotiation. All of these things are incredibly important for leaders, but we have added to that a classroom component. The classroom component is seven lectures on personal leadership—personal development. Topics include self-control, self-monitoring, goal-setting, how to deliver feedback to subordinates, and honing their personal leadership. Then the next semester they get another seven lessons on cross-cultural and organizational leadership, and that concludes the classroom component of a two-year program. This was a shock to my fellow Yale professors, because they are professors. In their mind, what professors do is teach classes. But when I said it was a core

² See Appendix (Yale Leader Development—2 Years).

program with only fourteen lessons, I referred them back to the 10%. I referred them back to how people develop as leaders.

I mean, think about it. Thirty percent is heredity, so the most we can effect is the 70%. And now when we look at how people learn to lead, we know that the classroom component is only 10%. So it is 10% times 70%; 7%. And that's if you do everything perfectly in the classroom. So if you do an average job, you've probably provided a 5% solution on a the whole problem. A nickel solution to a dollar problem. So you have got to have a way to get people engaged in leadership and coached on how they are doing. That is what you have to do if you want to move people's needle on leadership over time. I require students to build their own 360 degree assessment using software. They create this tool to get feedback on their personality, on their behavior, and then they deploy it to the people they choose. Why don't we just give them a prepared assessment?

Because more than a third of these people are not from the United States, and many of them are going to lead in other cultures. I give them a 360 assessment that was validated in Minneapolis, Minnesota. It's probably not going to apply very much to their circumstances when they are in Ghana running a nonprofit with local nationals. So a tremendous amount of tailorability is built in so that they get culturally sensitive feedback.

The other thing students do in that advanced leadership course (and this is the part that I think is really relevant to you all) is build a self-directed leader development plan. They put together a plan that articulates three development opportunities. The first is what they are going to do over the next year in terms of developing themselves in the context of their education. They are running their own nonprofits, in student government, in clubs, helping advise undergraduate clubs, working for community organizations downtown and all of these are rich in potential for developing their own leadership. So they plan for their development in those activities.

The second thing part of their plan is a six- ten-year timeline. They describe where they want to be in six to ten years in a strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, threats (SWOT) analysis. How are they going to get there? What's in their way? What's going to help them get there?

And the last part of the plan is a well-being component, where they articulate how they're going to reach their own personal goals in areas like physical fitness, mental state of affairs, relationships, spirituality, anything that's deeply personal to them—those parts of our lives that we usually forget about. I have more than fifteen years of experience with these plans because in every Army organization that I've led since 1999, every officer has created one of these plans for me. They shared them with their raters (who in business we would call coaches), and then those raters would bring the plans to me and we would figure out how to enable the officers' development.

First-year Yale students develop their plan and in their second year, they execute that plan. They join organizations; they do some leadership with peers, with undergraduates, in nonprofits around New Haven—wherever lies their passion. If you look up there in blue, you see leader development groups one, two, and three. These are eight-person groups—eight first-year students who are led by two second-years. The mission of those second-year students in those groups is to add value. That is all we tell them; add value. And they are evaluated by the first-years, which is a rude awakening for some of the MBA students who may have thought that if they were the leader they get a lot of perks.

This practicum creates the conditions for Yale students to lead, to have varying degrees of success at leading, and then to talk to coaches. I have hired a small corps of professional coaches who coach these second-years during this practicum. There is also a peer coaching program. Every student coaches someone else; every student is coached by someone else. And the point with these coaches, more than anything else, is accountability. One of the best coaches in this country, Marshall Goldsmith, who helped me hire my coaches, has a technique that he has used for many years where he calls someone, a friend of his whom he has known for a long time, whom he trusts. Calls them every evening, every single night, and all they do when that phone rings is they ask ten questions of each other. And it's questions like: Did you have more than two drinks today? How many push-ups did you do today? Did you do sixty minutes of cardio today? Have you told your wife and your family that you love and appreciate them today?

And it's ten quick questions; he says it takes about two minutes in the evening. And every single evening they make this call. But it is accountability. It is accountability for the kind of development that he wants to do because he got to pick the questions. Coaching and feedback

is very powerful in leader development. It changes people's behavior. Successful leader development programs load on three variables; the knowledge component, a reflection component, and experience. And when in doubt, add more experience at leading, because that's the 70% solution.

We are also building a feedback culture in the Yale School of Management. MBA students arrive at Yale as 290 individuals, and within two or three weeks they are closely bonded. When they see one another doing things in the classroom and they are working on teams, it's just all love and light. No one ever criticizes anyone's performance. No one ever says, "well, that was really a lame presentation." Its excessive and negative cohesion. Most people think of cohesion as a good thing, but when it creates intellectual dishonesty in your organization, it is a problem. I drove the point home in a business case competition that the school held during first-year orientation. Students were in eight-person groups. They had been there less than a week, just getting to know one another. The task was to take a business case that had been presented by Yale, and they would figure out how to build a successful business. They only had a day to complete their business plan, to come together as a team to do all of the research, analyze the business model presented, put it into a PowerPoint show, and then they presented it to us. A couple other professors and I did the judging. We finished the judging, figured out who was best and as we were walking out, I was supposed to announce the winner. Just before I announced the winner, a professor leans in to me and says, "Be sure you tell them that they all did well." [laughter] They have not even started business school. They are a pickup team. They spent a day on this enormous, challenging project, and we just saw this stuff and it is not good [laughter]. Good work for the constraints, but objectively, not ready for prime time.

So I walked out and looked at the students assembled in the auditorium; they are eagerly awaiting the win. And I said, "Look, you all are great students. We want you all to be at Yale. You competed heavily to come here but I have to tell you that every one of those presentations was bad." [laughter]. Their eyes got big, and there was nervous laughter, but, you know what? It was the truth. And they were bad because they were thrown together quickly. All of the plans would have failed. It was important to kind of send the message that you cannot go home yet, you have to go to business school and then when you graduate, you'll be good. Feedback and intellectual honesty in reality is key to personal growth. You have the same challenge here at

the JAG School. Your students are very well-educated, bright, capable people, many of them have never failed at anything in their lives, but you have to make them better. And sometimes you have to be honest about their performance and that was key in this program and would be key in any other leader development activity.

I used the self-development framework at West Point and it made a big difference. I also briefed the framework at the War College in 2003 and 2004. We were really able to transform people by paying attention to what their goals were and tried to help them get there, even if those goals seem to be indirect. I mean, one of the guys that we developed under the system was an aviator. He was able to get 325 hours of helicopter time and qualify in a second helicopter while he was there. One might say, "Well, how does that make him a better teacher at West Point? Shouldn't you be developing him as a faculty member, as a teacher?" And my response to that was, "No, not really." What I want to put in front of students is a strong, capable, well-developed individual and they will take care of the teaching.

We used this to put people into medical school. We had one person go to clinical psych grad school and get a Ph. D. and now they are a clinical psychologist. People did all kinds of things focused on their own developmental goals and they were the best instructors I had on the platform. So part of making this work was loosening it up a bit.

It is not rocket science to create a self-directed leader development plan; I never required a specific format. A single sheet of paper with a timeline at the bottom is sometimes enough.

I told them, I never wanted any of my faculty at West Point to stand up when I am giving them their award as they are leaving and say, you know, we said we were going to go to all of these Broadway shows and really take advantage of New York, but really my family just kind of hung around West Point. The key person who ensured successful quarterly reviews of the leader development plans was a GS-5 named Joanne Wright.

Joanne Wright was my administrative assistant. Joanne would get my directors lined up to come in every quarter and this would get done. I told her, "If you wait for me to tell you that it's time to bring people in to talk about these plans, it never will happen." I just told her that wouldn't happen because I am killing twenty-five meter zombie targets. But she

got them in there and it made a huge difference. Now my team and I are fielding an entire program at Yale built on this model. Recently I got a visit from two professors from the Darden School of Business here at the University of Virginia, and they were interested in Yale's leader development program. But like most professors, they have an academic frame towards how to deliver this kind of effect. Maybe this is the artilleryman in me coming out, but it's less about the execution of a curriculum and more about delivering effects. The effects come from, personal experiences at leading by individuals who are graded and fed back and coached by people in honest dialogue. That is what develops leaders.

And so as you think about how you develop people in your organization, remember the nickel solution on a dollar problem. Remember to focus your efforts in ways that are going to have impact on how people actually learn to lead. Many of us believe that by applying these sorts of principles where it hasn't been done before, like business schools, like other kinds of schools, that we can really change the world. Because when you take a person who has strong technical skills, whether it is somebody that is going to be a financial analyst down on Wall Street or somebody who is going to be an attorney for a senior leader, when you take someone who has those kinds of technical skills and you add to that the capacity to lead, now you have a person who can change the world. Now you have a person who can really leave their footprint in the world where they operate.

So I will end the same way I started, with just a tremendous amount of gratitude to you all. To folks like you all who touched so many Army officers along the way and make the Army run, make it run better, make it run more ethically, make it run legally, but also enable the innovation. Because without your input, the Army would be a walking dead-zone of innovation. The zombies would win. And when you all are in the mix, we know what we can accomplish, we know how to do it the right way, and we can sleep well at night knowing that we did a good job. So thank you all very much. I appreciate you.

Appendix

YALE LEADER DEVELOPMENT – 2 YEARS

