

## Archived Content

Information identified as archived on the Web is for reference, research or record-keeping purposes. It has not been altered or updated after the date of archiving. Web pages that are archived on the Web are not subject to the Government of Canada Web Standards.

As per the [Communications Policy of the Government of Canada](#), you can request alternate formats on the "[Contact Us](#)" page.

## Information archivée dans le Web

Information archivée dans le Web à des fins de consultation, de recherche ou de tenue de documents. Cette dernière n'a aucunement été modifiée ni mise à jour depuis sa date de mise en archive. Les pages archivées dans le Web ne sont pas assujetties aux normes qui s'appliquent aux sites Web du gouvernement du Canada.

Conformément à la [Politique de communication du gouvernement du Canada](#), vous pouvez demander de recevoir cette information dans tout autre format de rechange à la page « [Contactez-nous](#) ».

**SYLLABUS**  
**CANADIAN FORCES COLLEGE (CFC)**  
**JOINT COMMAND AND STAFF PROGRAMME**  
**RESIDENTIAL (JCSP RESID)**  
**AND**  
**JOINT COMMAND AND STAFF PROGRAMME**  
**DISTANCE LEARNING (JCSP DL)**  
**COMMANDANT'S PREFACE**

1. The Syllabus is the capstone document for the JCSP RESID and the JCSP DL. Specifically, it describes:
  - a. The organization and content of the syllabus;
  - b. The programme goals, outcomes and objectives; and
  - c. The detailed course outlines for each course.
2. The curriculum for the JCSP RESID and JCSP DL emphasizes operations, leadership, and national and international studies. It also examines aspects of command, ethics, operational planning, and defence management in Canada.
3. It is essential that all officers, on joining the staff, read and study Chapter 1 of this document to the extent that they clearly understand the curriculum for these programmes.

D.C. Hilton  
BGen  
Commandant

# JOINT COMMAND AND STAFF PROGRAMME SYLLABUS

## JCSP RESID AND JCSP (DL) — 2011/2012 EDITION

### TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>Commandant's Preface</b>		i
Table of Contents		ii
Chapter 1	<b>Programme Description</b>	
	<b>Programme Title</b>	1-1/9
	<b>Programme Aim</b>	1-1/9
	<b>Programme Goals, Learning Outcomes and Objectives</b>	1-1/9
	<b>Programme Composition, Course Titles and Descriptions</b>	1-5/9
	<b>Programme Length</b>	1-7/9
	<b>Programme Hours</b>	1-8/9
	<b>Programme Preparation Time</b>	1-8/9
	<b>National Qualifications, Identification Codes and International Equivalencies</b>	1-8/9
Chapter 2	<b>Student Assessment</b>	
	<b>General</b>	2-1/27
	<b>Assessment Standards</b>	2-1/27
	<b>Progress Monitoring</b>	2-2/27
	<b>Activity Matrix and Activity Assessment</b>	2-2/27
	<b>Student Progress Record</b>	2-5/27
	<b>Turnitin Requirements</b>	2-5/27
	<b>Academic Appeals</b>	2-5/27
	<b>Course and Programme Reports</b>	2-6/27
	<b>Assessment of Officer-Like Qualities</b>	2-7/27
	<b>Unsatisfactory Progress</b>	2-7/27
	<b>Academic Misconduct</b>	2-8/27
	<b>Progress Review Board</b>	2-8/27
	<b>Withdrawal Procedure and Policy</b>	2-9/27
	<b>Grading Standards</b>	2-10/27
	<b>Grading Rubrics and Marking Guides</b>	2-10/27

## CHAPTER ONE

### PROGRAMME DESCRIPTION

#### PROGRAMME TITLE

1. Joint Command and Staff Programme Residential (JCSP RESID) and Joint Command and Staff Programme Distance Learning (JCSP DL).

#### PROGRAMME AIM

2. The aim of the JCSP is to prepare selected senior officers of the Defence Team for command and/or staff appointments in a contemporary operating environment across the continuum of operations in national and international settings.

#### PROGRAMME GOALS, LEARNING OUTCOMES AND OBJECTIVES

3. In accordance with the OPDS, the JCSP RESID and the JCSP DL are offered during Developmental Period 3, the Advanced Officer Developmental Period. Through a range of professional educational activities, the programme develops officers to a level of knowledge and competence appropriate to the aim. The scope of both variants of the JCSP is designed to educate and prepare military officers and other national security leaders to be effective in leadership and staff positions in complex joint, interagency, and multinational settings across the full spectrum of conflict. Emphasis is placed on the following themes or programme goals:

- a. C1 — Command, Leadership and Ethics. The aim of Programme Goal C1 is to develop in each participant the requisite level of understanding of the conceptual foundations of leadership and command required to be effective in the institutional, operational and cross-cultural contexts across national and international settings.

Outcome Serial	Learning Outcome	Objective Serials	Learning Objectives	Learning Level
C101	At the end of DS 541, participants will have demonstrated the requisite knowledge and understanding of the conceptual foundations of leadership required to be effective in the institutional, operational, and cross-cultural contexts across national and international settings.	C101a	Analyse leadership using relevant theories, models, and cultural perspectives.	4
		C101b	Analyse the role of the leader as a steward of the profession.	4
		C101c	Synthesize theories, models and frameworks to make independent moral/ethical decisions.	5
		C101d	Examine capacities required to influence others in the institutional, operational and cross-cultural contexts across national and international environments.	3

Outcome Serial	Learning Outcome	Objective Serials	Learning Objectives	Learning Level
C102	At the end of DS 542 participants will have demonstrated the requisite knowledge & understanding of the conceptual foundations of command required to be effective in the institutional, operational, and cross-cultural contexts across national and international settings.	C102a	Apply principle-based decision-making in the institutional, operational, and cross-cultural contexts.	3
		C102b	Analyse command using relevant theories, models and regulatory frameworks.	4
		C102c	Describe the perspectives that characterize the institutional, multi-agency, and cross-cultural environment in which command is exercised in domestic and international operations.	2
		C102d	Comprehend the linkages among national capacities, government objectives, and defence management.	2

- b. C2 — Communications Skills. The aim of Programme Goal C2 is to develop the individual student's ability to do research, apply problem-solving techniques, and communicate effectively with internal and external audiences.

Outcome Serial	Learning Outcome	Objective Serials	Learning Objectives	Learning Level
C201	At the end of each course students will have applied research, problem-solving, and decision-making techniques to defend a position or point of view using the professional oral/ written communication skills and public affairs skills required to be effective in the institutional, operational and cross-cultural contexts across national and international settings.	C201a	Apply effective writing skills and demonstrate the ability to clearly articulate the required concepts.	3
		C201b	Apply effective reading skills, by evaluating, appraising and analysing assigned and supplementary reading material, and in researching new material.	3
		C201c	Apply effective listening skills by evaluating, appraising and analysing lectures and discussions. This will also include the generation of thoughtful and insightful questions or comments on the material under consideration.	3
		C201d	Apply effective speaking and presentation skills by giving briefings, seminars, and other presentations that demonstrate a clear understanding of the required topic. This will also include the generation of thoughtful and insightful questions or comments on the material under consideration.	3

Outcome Serial	Learning Outcome	Objective Serials	Learning Objectives	Learning Level
		C201e	Demonstrate the ability for creative thinking and problem-solving techniques.	3
		C201f	Demonstrate the ability for logical reasoning, argument and analysis in written and oral work.	3
		C201g	Demonstrate the ability to apply multiple decision-making techniques in practical situations.	3

- c. C3 — Military Operations Planning. The aim of Programme Goal C3 is to develop the students' ability to plan military operations at the operational level in support of federal government direction.

Outcome Serial	Learning Outcome	Objective Serials	Learning Objectives	Learning Level
C301	At the end of DS 543, students will have analysed warfare theory, examined the doctrinal concepts of CF operations in the contemporary operating environment, analysed warfare theory, and examined emerging concepts, capabilities and threats from a CF and component perspective.	C301a	Analyse the impact of social, political and technological shifts on the theory and practice of war.	4
C302	At the end of DS 544, students will have discussed the terminology and stages of the CF Operational Planning Process and applied the process in an operational-level exercise.	C302a	Interpret operational art, including the stages of the CFOPP, and apply the process up to and including stage III.	3
		C302b	Apply the operational functions and demonstrate their significance in planning joint and combined operations.	3

Outcome Serial	Learning Outcome	Objective Serials	Learning Objectives	Learning Level
C303	At the end of DS 546, students will have designed and produced operational plans for full-spectrum joint and combined operations within a contemporary operating environment.	C303a	Interpret the doctrine, organization, plans and routine operations of domestic operations and continental defence, including the involvement of OGDs.	3
		C303b	Interpret the doctrine, organization, plans and ongoing operations of expeditionary operations, including involvement of OGDs and NGOs.	3
		C303c	Design CONOPS, using the CF OPP, for full-spectrum joint and combined operations within the contemporary operating environment.	5

- d. C4 — Component Capabilities. The aim of Programme Goal C4 is to develop the students' understanding of component capabilities in military operations.

Outcome Serial	Learning Outcome	Objective Serials	Learning Objectives	Learning Level
C401	At the end of DS 545, students will have analysed the elements and capabilities of component power and applied the doctrinal concepts of component power in a contemporary operating environment.	C401a	Analyse the fundamentals, functions and command of components, and examine how they contribute to planning joint and combined operations.	4

- e. C5 — National Security and Defence Studies. The aim of Programme Goal C5 is to develop the students' ability to analyse Canadian national security, foreign and defence policies, and the internal and external factors that influence them.

Outcome Serial	Learning Outcome	Objective Serials	Learning Objectives	Learning Level
C501	At the end of DS 547, students will have examined Canadian policy-making and the major factors which	C501a	Analyse the theoretical underpinnings of strategic and national security-related concepts; state power and its usage; and approaches to the study of international relations.	4

Outcome Serial	Learning Outcome	Objective Serials	Learning Objectives	Learning Level
C501, Cont'd.	influence it. They will have compared the instruments and sources of power and institutional processes, socio-cultural determinants and strategic issues that shape Canadian policy. Students will also have examined the global environment with a focus on the United States, other key international actors, and various international organizations in which Canada plays a major role.	C501b	Compare and contrast the domestic and structural factors that influence Canadian governance, policymaking, and response mechanisms.	4
		C501c	Compare and contrast Canadian national security, foreign, defence, and development policies.	4
		C501d	Analyse the effects of emerging strategic issues, challenges and opportunities on Canadian foreign and defence policies.	4
		C501e	Analyse the relationship between Canada and the United States, and understand the differences between their foreign and defence policies.	4
		C501f	Analyse the international context (factors, actors, and systems) within which Canadian policies are generated and implemented.	4

#### **PROGRAMME COMPOSITION, COURSE TITLES AND DESCRIPTIONS**

4. Both JCSP programmes comprise seven discrete courses containing a variety of curriculum activities. These activities are optimized for DL or residential delivery depending on the programme variant, designed to attain the desired level of learning in the applicable subject. The courses delivered are as follows:

- a. DS 541 — Leadership and Ethics (LDR). The course uses lectures, practical exercises, case studies, and small group discussions to explore leadership theory, professional ethics, cultural complexity, the profession of arms, critical thinking, and problem solving to enhance students' leadership effectiveness. Participants apply

decision-making tools to resolve leadership scenarios, and subject matter experts provide evaluation and feedback based on experience and published research. Assessment is by participation in seminars and discussions, practical exercises and simulation, and written essays ranging in length from 1000 to 3000 words.

- b. DS 542 — Command and Management (COM). The course uses lectures, practical exercises, case studies, and small group discussions to explore the theory of command, the command environment, principle-based decision-making including negotiating and alternative perspectives, law of armed conflict, and Canadian Defence Management to enhance students' overall capacity to command. Participants apply decision-making tools to resolve command challenges, and subject matter experts provide evaluation and feedback based on experience and published research. Assessment is by participation in seminars and discussions, practical exercises and simulation, and a written essay (2500–3000 words).
- c. DS 543 — War and Society (WAS). This course examines the shifts in the practice of warfare as a product of society. Topics to be addressed are Warfare and the Ancients, Early and Late Industrialism, Emergence of Operational Art, and Into the Future — Informationalism. Assessment is by a combination of discussions and a 4000-word persuasive paper.
- d. DS 544 — Basic Joint Operational Planning (BOP). This course develops the basic knowledge and skills essential for the planning and conduct of joint and combined operations at the operational level. The first module consists of practical exercises during which students work in teams to produce operational designs and Concept of Operations (CONOP) documents for operations in the contemporary operating environment. The second module examines the significance of the operational functions in the conduct of contemporary warfare. Assessment is by oral presentations, synopses, tutorials, and a course confirmatory exam.
- e. DS 545 — Component Capabilities (CPT). This course focuses on the functions and fundamentals of the Maritime, Land, Aerospace and Special Operations components which form combat power in joint and combined operations. Study will look at the historic development of each of the CF components, their characteristics, and finally their role in joint and combined operations. Assessment is by oral presentations, case studies, and course confirmatory activity of five 800-word synopses.
- f. DS 546 — Advanced Joint Operational Planning (AOP). This course develops the advanced knowledge and skills for the planning and conduct of joint and combined operations across the spectrum of conflict at the operational level. The first module examines domestic operations, including a study of counterterrorism and consideration of other governmental departments involved in domestic and continental operations. The second examines expeditionary operations, involving a study of stability, peace support, and counter-insurgency operations. It includes consideration of the joint and multinational military forces available to a joint force commander to achieve effects across the spectrum of conflict, as well as the coordination required with other government departments and non-government organizations.

The third module involves practical exercises requiring the students to work in teams to produce the Concept of Operations (CONOP) documents for domestic operations and expeditionary operations. Assessment is by oral presentations, case studies, and a course confirmatory activity involving two practical exercises.

- g. DS 547 — National Security and International Affairs (SIA). This course analyses domestic and international factors that affect Canada and influence its policies. The first module provides the theoretical foundations for analysing and understanding state power, strategic studies and international relations. Later modules focus on the sociocultural factors, institutional processes, values, interests and issues that influence Canadian strategic decision-making; Canada's relationship with the United States; and Canada's role in various international organizations and the global power environment within which Canadian policies are shaped and implemented. Assessment is by presentations, participation in seminars, discussions, and a research paper (3000–4000 words).

## **PROGRAMME LENGTH**

5. JCSP RESID. JCSP RESID spans one academic year, inclusive of administration time and statutory holidays, but exclusive of opening and closing activities. The programme consists of seven courses delivered over four terms of classroom instruction, beginning in September and finishing in June. The JCSP RESID course structure comprises six one-credit Defence Studies (DS) courses and one two-credit DS course, as follows:

- a. DS 541 — Leadership and Ethics (1 credit);
- b. DS 542 — Command and Management (1 credit);
- c. DS 543 — War and Society (1 credit);
- d. DS 544 — Basic Joint Operational Planning (1 credit);
- e. DS 545 — Component Capabilities (1 credit);
- f. DS 546 — Advanced Joint Operational Planning (2 credits); and
- g. DS 547 — National Security and International Affairs (1 credit).

6. JCSP DL. JCSP DL spans two academic years and is divided into two parts, DL-1 and DL-2. DL-1 comprises four one-credit DS courses while DL-2 delivers two one-credit DS courses and one two-credit DS course, as follows:

- a. DL-1
  - (1) DS 541 — Leadership and Ethics (1 credit);
  - (2) DS 542 — Command and Management (1 credit);
  - (3) DS 543 — War and Society (1 credit); and

- (4) DS 544 — Basic Joint Operational Planning (1 credit).
- b. DL-2
- (1) DS 545 — Component Capabilities (1 credit);
  - (2) DS 546 — Advanced Joint Operational Planning (2 credits); and
  - (3) DS 547 — National Security and International Affairs (1 credit).

An on-site weekend in the fall starts the programme during DL-1 and a two-week summer on-site phase completes each academic year.

### **PROGRAMME HOURS**

7. JCSP RESID. The contact time for JCSP RESID will be a total of 816.0 hours. Contact time for the JCSP DL programme will be a total of 825.0 hours.

### **PROGRAMME PREPARATION TIME**

8. CFC uses a preparation time model that tracks the cumulative difference between the programme or non-curriculum time available for students to prepare for activities, and the specific time required to complete that preparation. On the debit side, the model tracks the amount of time required to read, research, reflect on, and prepare for each activity; this time is designated as Preparation Time (PT).

9. On the credit side of the model, contained in the standard programme day is scheduled study time, referred to as Assignment Preparation Time (APT). The model also assumes that students have, on average, three hours available to them each night, and six hours on the weekend, to prepare for activities. This is referred to as Individual Preparation Time (IPT). (Note: IPT is not normally assumed as available during field trips and scheduled academic breaks.) When the model identifies a deficit (i.e., when the time required for one or more activities (PT) exceeds the time available (APT, IPT) to do that preparation), APT periods are added to the programme's schedule to compensate.

10. The amount of preparation time (PT) estimated in the syllabus and scheduled for any particular activity assumes a 20-pages/hour reading rate, or in the case of discussions and exercises, for preparation. The published preparation time is an estimate of the hours an average student would need to achieve a satisfactory grade.

11. JCSP RESID. For the JCSP RESID, APT has been programmed into the work week where needed. The maximum IPT available in any given week is 18 hours on the basis of three hours per evening Monday through Thursday, plus a total of six hours on the weekend.

12. JCSP DL. For the JCSP DL, students spend much of their time in self-regulated study, either during the DL portions of the programme or in the evenings while on site at CFC. The latter is called Individual Preparation Time or IPT. Every Programme Day (on-site phases only) includes three hours of IPT, except during exercises where the hours are allocated to exercise play.

## **NATIONAL QUALIFICATIONS, IDENTIFICATION CODES AND INTERNATIONAL EQUIVALENCIES**

13. The following list indicates the National Qualification (NQual) and Identification (ID) Codes awarded for successful completion of the JCSP programmes:

- a. Joint Command and Staff Programme (RESID)
  - (1) ID Code: 116768
  - (2) NQual: AJGM — Senior Officer — CF Common Intermediate
  - (3) US Intermediate-Level JPME Credit 1\*
  - (4) Eight credits towards the completion of a Master of Defence (MDS) degree from the Royal Military College\*\*
  
- b. Joint Command and Staff Programme (DL AY 1 and 2)
  - (1) ID Code: 117594
  - (2) NQual: AJGM — Senior Officer — CF Common Intermediate
  - (3) US Intermediate-Level JPME Credit 1\*
  - (4) Eight credits towards the completion of a Master of Defence (MDS) degree from the Royal Military College\*\*
  
- c. Joint Reserve Command and Staff Programme (JCSP (DL) AY 1 only)
  - (1) ID Code: 116775
  - (2) NQual: AJGN — P Res Senior Officer
  - (3) US Intermediate-Level JPME Credit 1\*
  - (4) Four credits towards the completion of a Master of Defence (MDS) degree from the Royal Military College\*\*

\*In accordance with CM-0891-07, 21 June 2007, "Program for Joint Professional Military Education Phase 1 (JPME 1) Equivalent Credit".

\*\*Master of Defence Studies (MDS). The option of graduating with an MDS degree in conjunction with the JCSP (RESID) and DL programmes will be available to those students who meet RMC admission requirements for Graduate Studies, successfully complete the programme with the requisite academic standing, and meet the additional academic requirement of completing a 14,000–20,000-word major research project and an Electives course.

## CHAPTER 2

### STUDENT ASSESSMENT

#### GENERAL

1. Student assessment is an essential process at the Canadian Forces College. On the JCSP programmes, student assessment is a joint venture carried out by the faculty, which comprises members of the Directing Staff (DS), the resident Academic Staff (AS), and contracted Subject Matter Experts (SMEs). The DS write Course Reports (CR) and Programme Reports (PR) on each of their students, which in combination with the DNDLearn Gradebook, records their progress on JCSP.

2. A key responsibility of CFC faculty is to determine if students have achieved the prescribed learning outcomes and objectives. To aid this process, all courses require the student to complete a confirmatory activity such as essays, papers, assignments, oral presentations, chairing of seminars and discussions, seminar participation, and exercise deliverables. The appropriate faculty member will assess each confirmatory activity and the mark is entered in the Gradebook. Written work, primarily assessed by the Academic Staff, is assessed in accordance with the College academic instruction which is based on RMC policies.

3. Students are not ranked in order of merit but they are assessed relative to a common standard. That standard is that expected of a senior staff officer serving in a major headquarters. The combined CR and PR, along with the Gradebook, provide the formal record of what the student has achieved on the JCSP programme.

4. The following glossary of terms is used:

- a. **Assessment** — determining the learning level students have achieved for each learning objective and recording that learning level, as a grade of pass/fail. Assessment also has a programme evaluation function.
- b. **Evaluation** — determining if the instructional methods and materials are accomplishing the established goals, outcomes and objectives, as well as determining learner satisfaction with the material provided for learning.
- c. **Validation** — verifying that the programme has adequately prepared graduates to perform specific tasks or achieve specified DND goals.
- d. **Confirmatory activities** — activities such as tests, essays, presentations, seminars and exercises that serve the purposes of assessment, evaluation, and validation.

#### ASSESSMENT STANDARDS

5. Standards for student assessment are set and documented, including answer keys for tests and detailed rubrics for marking essay assignments. The Director of Academics carefully monitors assessment standards and maintains close contact with the academic staff and SMEs.

6. To help ensure standardization, the Directors of Programmes or the Director of Academics shall carry out random reviews of marked assignments. In addition, he/she will answer questions about marking as they arise and, if DS or students so request, review the marking of specific assignments. Further monitoring shall occur during regular reviews of student performance conducted by the Directors of Programmes. Any problems should be resolved at Progress Review Boards.

### PROGRESS MONITORING

7. Regular monitoring of a student's progress is required throughout the JCSP programmes to provide the following:

- a. a record of the student's participation in DP3 PME;
- b. early warning of difficulties/deficiencies;
- c. feedback on the effectiveness of the PME; and
- d. information for Progress Review Boards (PRBs).

Students experiencing difficulty in any area of performance are to be counselled and closely monitored.

### ACTIVITY MATRIX AND ACTIVITY ASSESSMENT

8. The following table briefly describes each type of JCSP learning activity, where it fits in the programme and who marks it, either faculty or contracted SME. The table lists only the formal assessment activities, activities for which an assessment form is used. However, the DS must also monitor and informally assess the student's overall performance throughout the programme. For example, in a discussion (DI) only one student, the Chair, is formally assessed; however, the performance of all the other student participants will be monitored, assessed and corrected when required.

<b>Activity Code</b>	<b>Activity Description</b>	<b>Marking Responsibility</b>	<b>Chair Assignment</b>
Discussion — DI	A structured verbal exchange of information in syndicate, usually chaired by a student. Serves to reinforce previously covered material.	DS	The DS or a student will chair this activity. Student chair is formally assessed.
Seminar — SM	A syndicate discussion based on a written deliverable prepared and distributed to syndicate members prior to the seminar.	DS (assisted by AS who normally will have marked the paper that forms the basis of the discussion)	The DS, an SME or a student will chair this activity. Student chair is formally assessed.
Lecture-Discussion	A lecture followed by a syndicate discussion of the presented	DS	The DS or a student will chair this activity. Stu-

<b>Activity Code</b>	<b>Activity Description</b>	<b>Marking Responsibility</b>	<b>Chair Assignment</b>
— LD	material and related preparatory readings. A plenary Q&A often follows.		dent chair is formally assessed.
Lecture — LE	A prepared oral presentation delivered by a staff member or one or more guest speakers, usually concluded with a question-and-answer period.	N/A	
Case Study — CS (Discussion)	A syndicate discussion based on an analysis of an historic event, battle, campaign or situation for the purpose of reinforcing previously covered curriculum material. The analysis is prepared and distributed to syndicate members prior to the seminar.	DS (assisted by AS or SME)	The DS, an SME or a student will chair this activity. Student chair is formally assessed.
Case Study — CS (Written)	A researched and detailed analysis of an historic event, battle, campaign or situation for the purpose of reinforcing previously covered curriculum material.	DS, AS or SME	N/A
Exercise — EX	Analysis of a situation coupled with a role-based, interactive application of previously covered curriculum material within a formatted, simulated scenario.	DS	All students will be assessed in the roles they are assigned.
Exam — XM	An exam is a summative or formal assessment instrument or device used to measure the performance, skill level or knowledge of a student on a specific subject matter. It is normally used at the conclusion of a course.	DS or AS	N/A
Essay — EY	A literary composition that answers a question or argues a point of view. More brief in scope and less formal in style than other activities such as the research paper (RP).	DS, AS or SME	N/A
Field Study — FS	A collective visit to agencies or locales outside the College to provide an experiential opportunity to examine issues related to programme curriculum in a	DS or AS	N/A

<b>Activity Code</b>	<b>Activity Description</b>	<b>Marking Responsibility</b>	<b>Chair Assignment</b>
	closer more practical setting.		
Lesson — LN	An activity within a distance learning course executed in a self-learning mode, which may comprise several components. It will include informal (formative) or formal (summative) assessment tools or written deliverables.	DS, AS or SME	N/A
Directed Reading — DR	An activity that is executed in a self-learning mode which enables a student to explore, in depth, a particular topic or area of knowledge. Directed Readings are an integral component of course content and may build on and extend explorations commenced in other courses. A confirmatory activity, such as an essay, quiz or assignment normally concludes a DR.	AS or SME	N/A
Quiz — QZ	An activity designed to measure whether the student has understood and absorbed the material recently presented. The student must correctly answer a series of questions, either with short written answers or, in the case of a multiple-choice test, by choosing the correct answer. Can be formal or informal.	DS, AS or SME	N/A
Individual Research Paper — RP	A written work that requires research and the preparation of an expository or persuasive essay using scholarly conventions.	AS or SME	N/A
Staff Exercise — SE	A written deliverable, presentation or interview based on the analysis of a simulated scenario for the purpose of teaching or reinforcing a specific element of the curriculum.	DS, AS or SME	N/A
Symposium — SY	A flexible activity that may combine several educational methodologies in order to explore a broad but defined issue area or	DS, AS, or SME	The DS, an SME or a student will chair this activity. Student chair is formally assessed.

Activity Code	Activity Description	Marking Responsibility	Chair Assignment
	topic. Symposia may utilize lectures, seminars, research papers, case studies and other educational activities, alone or in combination. Symposia often involve significant contributions of outside participants.		
Threaded Discussion — TD	An on-line activity in which a student posts a response to a question or questions, and then responds to other student responses.	DS, AS or SME	The DS, an SME or a student moderates this activity. Student moderator is formally assessed.
Tutorial — TU	An activity utilized to teach a particular solution or approach to an issue. Discourse within a tutorial is directed towards very specific ends.	DS	Tutorials are staff-led activities.

## STUDENT PROGRESS RECORD

9. As stated above, the student's performance in each activity is assessed using the applicable grading rubric, and the overall grade in that activity is entered into DNDLearn Gradebook, which, when completed, is the student's official mark record.

10. The Gradebook records individual assignment marks, final course averages, and the final overall academic average. Students who wish to use JCSP credits in pursuit of a graduate degree must achieve at least a B- (70%) standing in each course.

## TURNITIN REQUIREMENTS

11. Turn Students agree that by taking this course all required papers may be subject to submission for textual similarity review to Turnitin for the detection of plagiarism. All submitted papers will be included as source documents in the Turnitin reference database solely for the purpose of detecting plagiarism of such papers. The terms that apply to the Canadian Forces College's use of the Turnitin service are described on the [Turnitin web site](#).

## ACADEMIC APPEALS

12. Students who feel that they have grounds for complaint in academic matters (e.g., review of a grade) should, as a first step, approach the assigned AS or contracted SME, through their DS. If the matter cannot be settled at this level, appeal is made formally through the student's DS to the Programme Officer who shall pass the appeal to the Directors of Programmes for a ruling.

13. Key to this process is the expectation that disputed matters will be resolved as closely as possible to the level at which they originate, and as quickly as is consonant with careful review.

## COURSE AND PROGRAMME REPORTS

14. The DS will write a CR and a PR on each student in their syndicate. A separate PR is written for each academic year of JCSP DL.

15. The CR summarizes the student's performance at the end of each course, while the PR contains a narrative that details each student's achievements and development throughout the JCSP programme. The DS will write the PR based on the relevant CR, the Gradebook and the student's professional performance. The DS will comment on the student's demonstrated leadership, verbal and written communication skills, officer-like qualities, and academic performance. The DS, within the narrative, will assign an overall assessment level using the following categories:

- a. **Outstanding** — A clearly exceptional performance, demonstrating outstanding intellect, professional knowledge and personal attributes. Consistently contributed to all activities with a rare level of enthusiasm and capability, always exceeding the College standard and usually by a wide margin. Extremely high standard of leadership, projecting personality and character to inspire, direct and support peers. Outstanding potential to progress far in advance of peers. An officer in this category has exceptional leadership potential to command and to assume the most demanding staff appointments;
- b. **Superior** — An excellent performer, demonstrating high and at times outstanding intellect, professional knowledge and personal attributes. Highly motivated and consistently exceeding the college standard. Repeatedly praised for leadership and teamwork. Superior potential to progress in advance of his peers. An officer in this category is highly suitable for command and demanding staff appointments;
- c. **Good** — A strong performance, demonstrating solid and, at times, high intellect, professional knowledge and personal attributes. An officer who has demonstrated the requisite amount of initiative, enthusiasm and leadership to meet the high college standard and, in most cases, surpassed them. Potential to progress alongside the majority of his peers. An officer in this category can fulfill routine or specialist staff appointments and should, in due course, develop the ability to undertake more demanding ones. Such an officer can also be trusted to rise to the occasion of a command; and
- d. **Pass** — A satisfactory performance, demonstrating adequate and, at times, good or very good intellect, professional knowledge and personal attributes. A competent and hard-working officer who has put forth a creditable effort and has met the requirements of the course. An officer in this category can fulfill routine or specialist staff appointments and might, in due course, develop the ability to undertake more demanding ones. Such an officer might also in due course develop the potential for command.

PRs are written for the Commandant's signature and, on completion, are forwarded for inclusion in the graduate's PER files.

## ASSESSMENT OF OFFICER-LIKE QUALITIES

16. The Officer-Like Qualities are defined as follows:
- a. **Integrity** — Is the candidate just, honest and honourable with respect to superiors, subordinates, peers, and their work assignments?;
  - b. **Loyalty** — Is the candidate faithful to Canada, superiors, subordinates, and peers?;
  - c. **Conduct** — Does the candidate's personal behaviour, both on and off duty, reflect credit on him/herself and the CF?;
  - d. **Dedication** — Does the candidate indicate a willingness to persevere under trying circumstances and exhibit a desire to successfully complete the task(s) at hand?; and
  - e. **Courage** — Is the candidate courageous in resisting the temptation to abandon ideals or objectives in the face of danger or hardship, and does the candidate have the courage of his or her convictions?

Whether the student displays appropriate Officer-Like Qualities (OLQs) and a positive attitude will be observed throughout the programme. Any display of conduct ~~un~~“officer-like” may indicate that the candidate does not possess the necessary qualities to continue as an officer and may constitute grounds for failure and consequent release from the CF. Details shall be clearly documented in the officer's training file for action by a Progress Review Board (PRB) or Career Review Board (CRB).

## UNSATISFACTORY PROGRESS

17. Unsatisfactory progress is indicated by:
- a. Failure to pass a JCSP course or module;
  - b. Failure to display appropriate OLQs; or
  - c. Failure to demonstrate a positive attitude towards the programme.
18. **Advancement to next course.** Students must satisfactorily complete all course requirements before continuing on to the next course. Only the Directors of Programmes can grant exceptions to this rule.
19. **Failed Assignment.** If a student fails a confirmatory activity, he/she is allowed one supplementary test, or in the case of an essay, a rewrite. The supplementary (or rewritten essay) mark awarded will be no higher than B- (70). If the student fails the supplementary test or the essay rewrite, the student shall be placed on probation. The DS shall immediately notify the Programme Officer who will advise the Directors of Programmes. The Directors will decide whether the student may continue. In any case, a Progress Review Board (PRB) will be held to review the student's case.

## ACADEMIC MISCONDUCT

20. There are three categories of academic misconduct as follows:

- a. **Cheating**, some examples of which are the following:
  - (1) an act or attempt to give, receive, share or utilize unauthorized information or assistance before or during a test or examination;
  - (2) deliberate failure to follow rules on assignments, presentations, exercises, tests, or examination;
  - (3) tampering with official documents, including electronic records;
  - (4) falsifying research data;
  - (5) the inclusion, in footnotes, end notes or bibliographic listings, of sources that were not used in the writing of the paper or report; and
  - (6) the impersonation of a candidate at an examination.
- b. **Plagiarism**, which includes the following:
  - (1) deliberately and knowingly using the work of others and attempting to present it as original thought, prose or work. This includes, for example, the failure to appropriately acknowledge a source, misrepresentation of cited work, and misuse of quotation marks or attribution; and
  - (2) failure to adequately acknowledge collaboration or outside assistance.
- c. **Other violations of academic ethics**, including the following:
  - (1) deliberately not following ethical norms or guidelines in research;
  - (2) failure to acknowledge that work has been submitted for credit elsewhere; and
  - (3) misleading or false statements regarding work completed.

Penalties imposed upon students found guilty of academic misconduct may range from a mark of zero for the activity to dismissal from the programme.

## PROGRESS REVIEW BOARD

21. In addition to the reasons detailed above, a PRB shall be convened any time it becomes apparent that:

- a. a student's progress is so far below the minimum standard that there is virtually no likelihood of his/her attaining the standard;

- b. a student's continued presence on the course is adversely affecting the training or morale of the remainder of the participants;
- c. a student has been charged with academic misconduct; or
- d. a student has stopped communicating with his/her DS or the JCSP DL staff.

22. Failure. If a PRB determines that a student has failed the JCSP, that decision will be communicated to the student and to the student's chain of command.

23. The PRB assists the Commandant in formulating and discussing policy on student academic performance. As well, the PRB considers incidents which may arise in relation to these policies, such as lack of progress or academic failure. The Board composition is:

- a. Chairperson: As appointed by Cmdt;
- b. Members: Directors; and
- c. Secretary: Registrar.

Other members of the staff, such as the Chief Librarian, may be invited by the Chairperson to participate in the Board's discussions in order to provide professional assistance as required.

#### **WITHDRAWAL PROCEDURE AND POLICY**

24. To avoid being deemed a failure, a student must communicate his/her desire to withdraw. The pro forma for this communication is located on the DNDLearn website. Students contemplating withdrawal must first discuss the reason(s) with their DS. The faculty are all serving or former serving military officers who are very cognizant of the challenges the programme imposes on both family and work routine. The staff are committed to their professional military education and students will find that they can offer flexible solutions that eliminate many workload problems.

25. If a student elects to continue with the withdrawal process and is completing a DL course (not currently on site at CFC), he or she must seek the concurrence of the parent unit's Commanding Officer. An e-mail from the student's Commanding Officer, which provides justification for the decision to withdraw and clearly concurs with the decision, must be sent directly to the Registrar at CFC with an information copy to the student's DS. The Registrar's copy constitutes the formal withdrawal request.

26. When the formal request arrives at CFC, it will be staffed to the Commandant for his approval. When the Commandant approves the withdrawal, progress in the programme (the last fully completed course) will be filed in the Registrar's database and the DL staff will remove the student from the programme.

27. If a student elects to withdraw while attending the residential programme or during a DL on-site phase, the student's DS will arrange for an interview with the appropriate Programme Director and the Commandant for the final approval of the withdrawal.

28. All students who leave the programme prior to graduation are required to complete an “exit survey” that is available on DND Learn.

### GRADING STANDARDS

29. Assessment of work on JCSP will be expressed in either numeric or letter form. Letter marks will be converted to their numerical equivalent and recorded in the Grade Book; the conversion is made using the table below, which is taken from the Graduate Studies Calendar from the Royal Military College (RMC) of Canada.

#### JCSP Letter-Percentage Grade Table

Letter Grade	Percentage Relationship	Letter-Number Conversion
A+	94-100	95 (rarely — 100)
A	87-93	90
A-	80-86	83
B+	76-79	78
B	73-75	75
B-	70-72	72
C+	*66-69	68
C	*63-65	64
C-	*60-62	61
D+	*56-59	58
D	*53-55	54
D-	*50-52	51
Fail	*Below 50	

\*Failure in an RMC graduate-level “required course”.

### GRADING RUBRICS AND MARKING GUIDES

30. Rubrics are a simplified way to grade student deliverables and participation and help DS decide what mark a student should receive for his/her effort. Rubrics save time and facilitate the objective assignment of marks. More important than these two reasons, however, is that when rubrics are presented to the students beforehand it tends to result in the submission of better-quality work. The Canadian Forces College is committed to pedagogical excellence and accountability in all aspects of its curriculum. There follows, therefore, a set of comprehensive assessment forms that shall be used for marking assignments or activities completed during the JCSP.

## Marking Guide for Academic Written Work

	<b>A</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>C</b>	<b>F</b>
<b>Argument (45%–70%)</b>				
Organization	Essay proceeds logically from start to finish and is coherent throughout.	Essay includes some minor logical inconsistencies, but they hardly detract from the overall coherence of the argument.	Significant logical inconsistencies in parts of the paper make the overall credibility of the argument somewhat dubious.	The essay is illogical, incoherent, and as a result completely unconvincing.
Thesis Quality	Thesis, whether implicit or explicit, is absolutely clear and highly original.	Thesis, whether implicit or explicit, is clear and deliberate.	Thesis is identifiable in some form, with effort.	Essay does not contain — either implicitly or explicitly — a thesis.
Objectivity	Essay demonstrates a masterful grasp of all sides of the issue.	Essay effectively recognizes a variety of points of view.	Essay is clearly, albeit unintentionally, partial. It either fails to deal with contrary points of view out of ignorance or deals with them unfairly.	Essay is deliberately not impartial. The author has used the paper as a pulpit instead of as a framework for rigorous critical analysis.
Analysis	Analytical abilities on display are clearly superior and reflect an originality of thinking.	Analytical abilities on display demonstrate an ability to separate ideas into their component parts.	Analytical abilities on display are inconsistent. Some ideas are clear and fully understood; others are not.	Paper reproduces arguments from other sources with no evidence of understanding.
<b>Evidence (15%-40%)</b>				
Depth	Essay draws from sources that represent the best primary (if applicable) and most comprehensive secondary information on the subject. Quantity of sources exceeds expectations.	Essay draws from a legitimate variety of primary (if applicable) and relatively comprehensive secondary information. Quantity of sources meets or exceeds expectations.	While the essay may draw from a significant number of sources, the information obtained from those sources is largely surface-level (for example, encyclopaedia entries and/or newspaper articles)	Essay is drawn largely, if not exclusively, from inappropriate material.

	<b>A</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>C</b>	<b>F</b>
Breadth	Essay draws from an impressive variety of sources and perspectives.	Essay draws from an acceptable variety of sources and perspectives.	Sources either come largely from a single perspective or are quantifiably insufficient to meet the demands of the assignment.	Sources are excessively limited in quantity and represent an excessively limited point of view.
Synthesis	Presentation of the evidence demonstrates a masterful understanding of its themes, both specific and general.	Presentation of the evidence demonstrates a clear understanding of its themes, both specific and general.	Presentation of the evidence demonstrates a flawed understanding of either its specific or general themes.	Presentation of the evidence demonstrates a flawed understanding of both its specific and general themes.
Relevance	Evidence is directly applicable to the analysis throughout.	Evidence is largely applicable to the analysis throughout.	Some of the evidence is clearly tangential and detracts from the credibility of the argument.	Evidence does not contribute to a fulfillment of the goals of the assignment.
<b>Writing (10%)</b>				
Overall	Grammar, punctuation, and spelling are virtually flawless. Language and word choice are appropriate throughout.	Limited flaws in grammar, punctuation, and/or spelling do not detract from the overall message of the essay. Some minor problems with language and word choice are noted but not overly problematic.	Significant flaws in some of grammar, punctuation, spelling, language and/or word choice.	Paper is incoherent because of flaws in grammar, punctuation, spelling, language, and/or word choice.
<b>Format (5%)</b>				
Overall	Essay follows CFC scholarly conventions including proper citation methods virtually flawlessly.	Only minor flaws in terms of CFC scholarly conventions including citation methods.	Significant flaws in terms of CFC scholarly conventions (likely including citation methods).	Paper displays a blatant disregard for CFC scholarly conventions.

## A guide to differentiating between the marks

- A+ level work is truly exceptional. It is objectively superior to what could have been fairly expected and has caused the reader to think, or see an issue, at least temporarily, in a new way.
- A and A– level work is clearly superior. If an assessor has difficulty determining whether a paper deserves an A– or a B+, then the paper should be awarded a B+. There should not be any hesitancy when it comes to grades of A– and above.
- B+ and C+ level work represent optimal achievement under reduced expectations. In other words, a B+ is the best B there can be.
- The grade B– is reserved for papers that, on the whole, clearly exceed the criteria for a C. At the same time, however, specific aspects of these papers deserve no more than C-range grades.
- The grade C– is reserved for papers whose redeeming features only barely allow them to pass. F-level work objectively does not fulfill the requirements or the goals of the assignment. There should be absolutely no hesitancy when it comes to the grade F. If there is, the paper should be awarded a D.

## Marking Guide for Military Writing

	<b>A</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>C</b>	<b>F</b>
<b>Argument (70%)</b>				
Organization	Paper proceeds logically from start to finish and is coherent throughout.	Paper includes some minor logical inconsistencies, but they hardly detract from the overall coherence of the argument.	Significant logical inconsistencies in parts of the paper make the overall credibility of the argument somewhat dubious.	The paper is illogical, incoherent, and as a result completely unconvincing.
Paper Quality	Paper, whether implicit or explicit, is absolutely clear and highly original.	Paper, whether implicit or explicit, is clear and deliberate.	Paper is identifiable in some form, with effort.	Paper does not contain — either implicitly or explicitly — a paper.
Objectivity	Paper demonstrates a masterful grasp of all sides of the issue.	Paper effectively recognizes a variety of points of view.	Paper is clearly, albeit unintentionally, partial. It either fails to deal with contrary points of view out of ignorance or deals with them unfairly.	Paper is deliberately partial. The author has used the paper as a pulpit instead of as a framework for rigorous critical analysis.

	<b>A</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>C</b>	<b>F</b>
Analysis	Analytical abilities on display are clearly superior and reflect an originality of thinking.	Analytical abilities on display demonstrate an ability to separate ideas into their component parts.	Analytical abilities on display are inconsistent. Some ideas are clear and fully understood; others are not.	Paper reproduces arguments from other sources without any evidence of understanding.
<b>Writing (30%)</b>				
Overall	Grammar, punctuation, spelling are virtually flawless. Language and word choice are appropriate throughout.	Limited flaws in grammar, punctuation, and/or spelling do not detract from the overall message of the paper. Some minor problems with language and word choice are noted but not overly problematic.	Significant flaws in some of grammar, punctuation, spelling, language and/or word choice.	Paper is incoherent because of flaws in grammar, punctuation, spelling, language, and/or word choice.
<b>Brevity</b>	<b>0% deducted</b>	<b>5% deducted</b>	<b>20% deducted</b>	<b>30% deducted</b>
	BN written in 2 pages. Synopsis written in 800 words.	BN written in 2½ pages. Synopsis written in 801-850 words.	BN written in 3 pages. Synopsis written in 851-900 words.	BN written in over 3 pages. Synopsis written in more than 900 words

### **A guide to differentiating between the marks**

- A+-level work is truly exceptional. It is objectively superior to what could have been fairly expected and has caused the reader to think, or see an issue — at least temporarily — in a new way.
- A and A--level work is clearly superior. If an assessor has difficulty determining whether a paper deserves an A- or a B+, then the paper should be awarded a B+. There should not be any hesitancy when it comes to grades of A- and above.
- B+ and C+-level work represent optimal achievement under reduced expectations. In other words, a B+ is the best B there can be.
- The grade B- is reserved for papers that, on the whole, clearly exceed the criteria for a C. At the same time, however, specific aspects of these papers deserve no more than C-range grades.
- The grade C- is reserved for papers whose redeeming features only barely allow them to avoid failure.

- F-level work objectively does not fulfill the requirements or goals of the assignment. There should be absolutely no hesitancy when it comes to the grade F. If there is, the paper should be awarded a D.

### Marking Guide for Syndicate Chairs

	<b>A</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>C</b>	<b>F</b>
<b>Intellectual Rigour (30%)</b>				
Introduction	Provides summary of themes in readings, clear thesis statement, and road map of presentation.	Mentions readings and includes clear thesis statement.	Some sense of an argument indicated.	Provides no sense of where presentation is headed.
Understanding	Demonstrates very good understanding of the readings and their application to the thesis.	Readings are used to support thesis.	Some of the readings are used to support the thesis.	Does not reference the readings.
<b>Effective Communication (10%)</b>				
Delivery	Communicates ideas with some enthusiasm, proper voice projection, appropriate language and clear delivery while making some eye contact	Communicates ideas clearly. No significant delivery problems.	Some difficulty communicating ideas due to problem with voice projection, language, or eye contact.	Ideas are not clear.
Organization	Very good organization and pacing. Meets time stipulations.	Generally organized but some difficulties meeting time stipulations.	Some difficulties in organization and/or meeting time stipulations.	No sense of organization. Presentation is far too long/short.
Written Summary	Meets all requirements and is generally free of typographical errors.	Meets almost all requirements and is generally free of typographical errors.	Meets some of the requirements but contains typographical errors.	None provided.
<b>Overall Impact (10%)</b>				
Impact on Discussion	Level of discussion is somewhat better because of the presentation.	Presentation has limited impact on level of discussion.	Presentation has no impact on level of discussion.	Presentation does not allow for constructive discussion.

	<b>A</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>C</b>	<b>F</b>
<b>Structure and Control (10%)</b>				
Organization	Discussion proceeded logically thanks to clear, implicit or explicit, direction from the chair.	Most of the discussion proceeded logically thanks to clear, implicit or explicit, direction from the chair.	Discussion jumped from issue to issue resulting in surface-level exchanges of opinions and ideas.	Topics covered in the discussion diverged significantly from the original outline.
Discussion Environment	Chair enabled all students to have reasonable opportunities to speak.	Chair was generally successful in providing all students with opportunities to speak.	Chair was only somewhat in control of the discussion environment.	Interventions were required by senior staff to maintain order.
<b>Flexibility (30%)</b>				
Response to Criticism	Chair welcomed opposing views and used them to further advance the discussion.	Chair welcomed and responded to opposing views.	Chair struggled to accommodate opposing views and tended to take them personally.	Chair's conduct actively discouraged opposing views.
<b>Synthesis 10%</b>				
Summary of Views	Thoughtful, organized, and engaging summary of the discussion clearly added to the students' learning experience.	Summary of the discussion captured the major issues being considered.	Effort was made to summarize the discussion.	No summary at the end of the discussion.

### Guide to differentiating between the marks

- A+ level work is truly exceptional. It is objectively superior to what could have been fairly expected and has caused the entire group to think, or see an issue — at least temporarily — in a new way. If members of the group would be surprised that their colleague had received an A+, then that grade is not deserved.
- A/A– level work is clearly superior. The assessor must be absolutely convinced that had this particular student not given the presentation, the quality of the learning experience for the entire group would have been inferior.
- B+ and C+ level work should be reserved for students who are capable of exhibiting A-like qualities but fail to do so in a consistent manner. A student who chairs consistently, predictably and certainly acceptably but also demonstrates occasional flashes of excellence would receive a grade of B+. A relatively unprepared chair who demonstrates an occasional flash of brilliance would receive a grade of C+.

- The grade B– is reserved for those instances when the assessor cannot be certain whether the faults in performance at the coordination level should be attributed either to a lack of effort or to issues beyond the chair’s control, and/or at the analytical level should be attributed either to a lack of effort or a sincere misunderstanding.
- The grade C– is reserved for students who have achieved the absolute bare minimum as chair.
- To receive an F, the student’s performance as chair must have clearly made the learning experience worse for all of those involved. There should be absolutely no hesitancy when it comes to the grade F. If there is, the student’s performance as chair should be awarded a D.

**Marking Guide for Exercises — Stage Two: Orientation**

	<b>A</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>C</b>	<b>F</b>
<b>Mission Analysis (including Op Design) (60%)</b>				
Organization	Analysis proceeds logically from start to finish, is coherent throughout, and involves constant revisiting of previously assessed components of the Orientation stage.	Analysis includes some minor logical inconsistencies, and involves some revisiting of previously assessed components of the Orientation stage.	Significant logical inconsistencies in parts of the analysis make the overall credibility of the argument somewhat dubious. Little revisiting of previously assessed components of the Orientation stage.	The analysis is illogical, incoherent, and as a result completely unconvincing. No revisiting of previously assessed components of the Orientation stage.
Analytical Abilities	Analytical abilities on display are clearly superior and reflect an originality of thinking.	Analytical abilities on display demonstrate an ability to separate ideas into their component parts.	Analytical abilities on display are inconsistent. Some ideas are clear and fully understood; others are not.	Analytical abilities on display are weak. Ideas are not clear or fully understood.
Understanding	Demonstrates very good understanding of the process and its application to the analytic process.	Demonstrates good understanding of the process and its application to the analytic process.	Demonstrates limited understanding of the process and its application to the analytic process.	Demonstrates weak understanding of the process and its application to the analytic process.
Participation in Discussion	Enthusiastic and educated participation in all discussions.	Enthusiastic and educated participation in some discussions.	Little productive participation in discussions.	No productive participation in discussions.

	<b>A</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>C</b>	<b>F</b>
Synthesis	Demonstrates a masterful understanding of relevant themes, both specific and general.	Demonstrates a clear understanding of relevant themes, both specific and general.	Demonstrates a flawed understanding of either specific or general themes.	Demonstrates a flawed understanding of both specific and general themes.
<b>Mission Statement and Commander's Intent Assignments (20%)</b>				
Written Summary	Meets all requirements and is generally free of typographical errors.	Meets almost all requirements and is generally free of typographical errors.	Meets some of the requirements and contains typographical errors.	Meets few of the requirements and contains typographical errors.
<b>Mission Analysis Brief (20%)</b>				
Content	Addresses all of the pertinent issues in an accurate and concise manner IAW the templates provided.	Addresses all of the pertinent issues in an accurate and concise manner.	Addresses all of the pertinent issues in an accurate and concise manner.	Addresses few of the pertinent issues in an accurate and concise manner.
Delivery	Communicates rehearsed ideas with confidence, knowledge of the material, proper voice projection, appropriate language and clear delivery while making some eye contact.	Communicates ideas clearly with knowledge of the material. No significant delivery problems.	Some difficulty communicating ideas due to lack of knowledge, voice projection or language problem, or lack of eye contact.	Briefing is delivered with little confidence or knowledge.
Organization	Very good organization and pacing. Meets time stipulations.	Generally organized but some difficulties meeting time stipulations.	Some difficulties in organization and/or meeting time stipulations.	No sense of organization. Presentation is far too long/short.

### **A guide to differentiating between the letters**

- –A+” level work is truly exceptional. It is objectively superior to what could have been fairly expected and has caused the entire group to think, or see an issue — at least temporarily — in a new way. If members of the group would be surprised that the syndicate had received an A+, then that grade is not deserved.
- –A” and –A–” level work is clearly superior.
  - Syndicate. In order to achieve a grade of at least an A–, the participation by all members of the syndicate was noticeably better than average, the quality of the analysis, products and briefing skills was superb, all JOPG members learned a great deal from the analysis

they conducted, and the overall excellent group effort was well orchestrated. If an assessor has difficulty determining whether the work deserves an A- or a B+, then the work should be awarded a B+. There should not be any hesitancy when it comes to grades of A- and above.

- Individual. In order to achieve a grade of at least an A-, the student's level of preparation and participation must be outstanding and show highly developed solutions that are supported by sound logical thought process.
- -B+ and -C+ level work represent optimal achievement under reduced expectations.
  - Syndicate. A -B+ is the best -B there can be. -B+ and -C+ level work should be reserved for syndicates who are capable of exhibiting -A-like qualities but fail to do so in a consistent manner.
  - Individual. A -B+ is the best -B there can be. -B+ and -C+ level work should be reserved for students who are capable of exhibiting -A-like qualities but fail to do so in a consistent manner. The level of preparation was good to very good, showed well-developed solutions that were supported by good logical thought process, participation level was better than average, quality of analysis and the products and briefing skills were good to very good.
- The grade -B- is reserved for work that, on the whole, clearly exceeded the criteria for a -C-. At the same time, however, specific aspects of the work deserved no more than -C-range grades.
  - Syndicate. The grade -B- is reserved for those instances when the assessor cannot be certain whether the faults in performance at the coordination level should be attributed to either a lack of effort or to issues beyond the syndicate's control, and/or at the analytical level should be attributed to either a lack of effort or to a sincere misunderstanding.
  - Individual. This grade is reserved for students who are capable of exhibiting A-like qualities but fail to do so in a consistent manner. Level of preparation was good to very good, showed developed solutions that were supported by logical thought process, participation level was better than average, quality of analysis, products and briefing skills were good to very good.
- The grade -C- is reserved for presentations whose redeeming features only barely allow them to avoid failure.
  - Syndicate. The grade -C- is reserved for the syndicate which has achieved the absolute bare minimum.
  - Individual. Level of preparation was satisfactory, showed barely adequate solutions based on flawed analysis, participation level was low and the quality of analysis, product/and briefing skills was lower than expected.
- -F-level work objectively does not fulfill the requirements or the goals of the assignment.

- Syndicate. To receive an “F”, the syndicate’s performance must have clearly made the learning experience worse for all of those involved. There should be absolutely no hesitancy when it comes to the grade “F”. If there is, the syndicate’s performance overall should be awarded a “D”.
- Individual. Level of preparation was inadequate, provided unworkable solutions based on faulty logic, participation level was unsatisfactory and the quality of the analysis, products and briefing skills was poor.

### Marking Guide for Exercises — Stage Three: COA Development

	A	B	C	F
<b>COA Development, Refinement and Validation (60%)</b>				
Organization	Analysis proceeds logically from start to finish, is coherent throughout, and involves constant revisiting of previously assessed components of the Orientation stage.	Analysis includes some minor logical inconsistencies, and involves some revisiting of previously assessed components of the Orientation stage.	Significant logical inconsistencies in parts of the analysis make the overall credibility of the argument somewhat dubious. Little revisiting of previously assessed components of Orientation stage.	The analysis is illogical, incoherent, and as a result completely unconvincing. No revisiting of previously assessed components of the Orientation stage.
Analytical Abilities	Analytical abilities on display are clearly superior and reflect an originality of thinking.	Analytical abilities on display demonstrate an ability to separate ideas into their component parts.	Analytical abilities on display are inconsistent. Some ideas are clear and fully understood; others are not.	Analytical abilities on display are weak. Ideas are not clear or fully understood.
Understanding	Demonstrates very good understanding of the process and its application to the analytic process.	Demonstrates good understanding of the process and its application to the analytic process.	Demonstrates limited understanding of the process and its application to the analytic process.	Demonstrates weak understanding of process and its application to analytic process.
Participation in Discussion	Enthusiastic and educated participation in all discussions.	Enthusiastic, educated participation in some discussions.	Little productive participation in discussions.	No productive participation in discussions.
Synthesis	Demonstrates a masterful understanding of relevant themes, both specific and general.	Demonstrates a clear understanding of relevant themes, both specific and general.	Demonstrates a flawed understanding of either specific or general themes.	Demonstrates a flawed understanding of both specific and general themes.

	<b>A</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>C</b>	<b>F</b>
<b>Information and Decision briefs (20%)</b>				
Content	Addresses all pertinent issues in an accurate and concise manner IAW templates provided.	Addresses all of the pertinent issues in an accurate and concise manner.	Addresses all of the pertinent issues in an accurate and concise manner.	Addresses few of the pertinent issues in an accurate and concise manner.
Delivery	Communicates rehearsed ideas with confidence, knowledge of the material, proper voice projection, appropriate language and clear delivery while making some eye contact.	Communicates ideas clearly with knowledge of the material. No significant delivery problems.	Some difficulty communicating ideas due to lack of knowledge, voice projection, language, or lack of eye contact.	Briefing is delivered with little confidence or knowledge.
Organization	Very good organization and pacing. Meets time stipulations.	Generally organized but some difficulties meeting time stipulations.	Some difficulties in organization and/or meeting time stipulations.	No sense of organization. Presentation is far too long/short.
<b>CONOP Preparation (20%)</b>				
Written Summary	Meets all requirements and is generally free of typographical errors.	Meets almost all requirements and is generally free of typographical errors.	Meets some of the requirements and contains typographical errors.	Meets few of the requirements and contains typographical errors.
Situation Para	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A detailed understanding of the situation and the implications for the JTF. It should include linkages to the strategic level as well as cross-references to other elements of National Power (DIME).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A repeat of the briefings from the exercise.</li> <li>• A clear understanding of the situation and how it applies to the JTF.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A repetition of what was given to the students from the exercise.</li> <li>• The level is too high or too low.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A misunderstanding of the situation; i.e., the wrong problem to solve.</li> </ul>

	<b>A</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>C</b>	<b>F</b>
Commander's Intent Para	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A detailed understanding of the aim, objectives and end state.</li> <li>• These elements are nested together and the operational design is clearly articulated.</li> </ul> <p>The elements in the commander's intent logically nest into the higher commander's design and the political end states.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A repeat of the briefings from the exercise.</li> <li>• A narrative of the operational design.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The aim is not clear. The articulation of aim, objectives and end state is not linked.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A misunderstanding of the aim, objectives or end state.</li> </ul>
Commander's Analysis Para	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A detailed understanding of the elements of operational design.</li> <li>• These elements are nested together and the operational design is clearly articulated.</li> </ul> <p>The elements in the commander's intent logically nest into the higher commander's design and the political end states.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A repeat of the briefings from the exercise.</li> </ul> <p>A simple narrative of the operational design without the nesting/linkages.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The analysis is wrong (i.e., is not what was approved by the commander).</li> <li>• The elements of design are not clear.</li> </ul> <p>The articulation of the elements is not linked.</p>	<p>A misunderstanding of or misapplication of the elements of design.</p>
Conduct of Operations Para	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A clearly articulated narrative of how the operations will be conducted.</li> <li>• This para should articulate how the various elements of the JTF will nest together and be linked to the operational design.</li> </ul> <p>These elements should logically</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A repeat of the briefings from the exercise.</li> </ul> <p>A simple narrative of the operation without the nesting/linkages.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The description of the operation is too detailed and goes below the component level.</li> <li>• The narrative is not clear.</li> </ul> <p>The articulation does not link the elements.</p>	<p>A misunderstanding of the operation agreed to; i.e., it is the wrong one.</p>

	<b>A</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>C</b>	<b>F</b>
	nest into the higher commander's design and the political end states.			
Tasks Para	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A clearly articulated narrative of the tasks to the components.</li> <li>• Description given of what is to be achieved (conditions/ effects), not how to do it.</li> <li>• This para should articulate how the various elements of the JTF will nest together and be linked to the operational design.</li> </ul> <p>These elements should logically nest into the higher commander's design and the political end states.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A repeat of the briefings from the exercise.</li> <li>• A simple narrative of the operation without the nesting/link-ages to the operational design.</li> <li>• Misses some key tasks.</li> <li>• Somewhat prescriptive rather than condition-based.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The description of the tasks is too prescriptive.</li> <li>• Tasks are too detailed and go below the component level.</li> <li>• The narrative is not clear.</li> </ul> <p>The articulation of the elements is not linked.</p>	A misunderstanding of the operation agreed to; i.e., it is the wrong one.
Service Support Para	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A clearly articulated narrative of the concept for supporting operations.</li> <li>• This para should articulate how the various elements of the JTF will nest together and be linked to the operational design.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A repeat of the briefings from the exercise.</li> <li>• A simple narrative of the operation without the nesting/ linkages to the operational design.</li> <li>• Misses some key tasks.</li> </ul> <p>Somewhat prescriptive rather than condition-based.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A very broad concept of support without linking it to the operation overall.</li> <li>• The narrative is not clear.</li> </ul>	No concept of support.

**A guide to differentiating between the letters**

- A+ level work is truly exceptional. It is objectively superior to what could have been fairly expected and has caused the entire group to think, or see an issue — at least temporarily — in a new way. If members of the group would be surprised that the syndicate had received an A+, then that grade is not deserved.
- A and A– level work is clearly superior.
  - Syndicate. In order to achieve a grade of at least an A–, the participation by all members of the syndicate was noticeably better than average, the quality of the analysis, products and briefing skills was superb, all JOPG members learned a great deal from the analysis they conducted, and the overall excellent group effort was well orchestrated. If an assessor has difficulty determining whether the work deserves an A– or a B+, then the work should be awarded a B+. There should not be any hesitancy when it comes to grades of A– and above.
  - Individual. In order to achieve a grade of at least an A- the student’s level of preparation and participation must be outstanding and show highly developed solutions that are supported by sound logical thought process.
  - B+ and C+ level work represent optimal achievement under reduced expectations.
  - Syndicate. A B+ is the best B there can be. B+ and C+ level work should be reserved for syndicates who are capable of exhibiting A-like qualities but fail to do so in a consistent manner.
  - Individual. B+ and C+ level work The level of preparation was good to very good, showed well-developed solutions that were supported by good logical thought process, participation level was better than average, quality of analysis and the products and briefing skills were good to very good.
- The grade B– is reserved for work that, on the whole, clearly exceeded the criteria for a C. At the same time, however, specific aspects of the work deserved no more than C-range grades.
  - Syndicate. The grade B– is reserved for those instances when the assessor cannot be certain whether the faults in performance at the coordination level should be attributed to either a lack of effort or to issues beyond the syndicate’s control, and/or at the analytical level should be attributed to either a lack of effort or to a sincere misunderstanding.
  - Individual. This grade is reserved for students who are capable of exhibiting A-like qualities but fail to do so in a consistent manner. Level of preparation was good to very good, showed developed solutions that were supported by logical thought process, participation level was better than average, quality of analysis, products and briefing skills were good to very good.
- The grade C– is reserved for presentations whose redeeming features only barely allow them to avoid failure.
  - Syndicate. The grade C– is reserved for the syndicate which has achieved the absolute bare minimum.

- Individual. Level of preparation was satisfactory, showed barely adequate solutions based on flawed analysis, participation level was low and the quality of analysis, product/and briefing skills was lower than expected.
- F-level work objectively does not fulfill the requirements or the goals of the assignment.
  - Syndicate. To receive an F, the syndicate's presentation must have clearly made the learning experience worse for all of those involved. There should be absolutely no hesitancy when it comes to the grade F. If there is, the syndicate's presentation should be awarded a D.
  - Individual. Level of preparation was inadequate, provided unworkable solutions based on faulty logic, participation level was unsatisfactory, and the quality of the analysis, products and briefing skills was poor.

## Marking Guide for Syndicate Activities

	<b>A</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>C</b>	<b>F</b>
<b>Participatory Contribution (40%)</b>				
Relation to Peers	Displays leadership in actively supporting, engaging and listening to peers (ongoing).	Actively supports, engages and listens to peers (ongoing).	Limited interaction with peers.	No interaction with peers.
Participation	Displays leadership in playing an active role in discussions (ongoing).	Plays an active role in discussions (ongoing).	When/where prepared, participates constructively in discussions.	Never participates.
<b>Intellectual Contribution (30%)</b>				
Preparation	Arrives fully prepared, having also done additional readings.	Arrives fully prepared.	Arrives noticeably less than entirely prepared.	Unprepared.
Delivery	Communicates ideas with some enthusiasm, proper voice projection, appropriate language and clear delivery while making some eye contact. Excellent use of audio-visual presentations.	Communicates ideas clearly. No significant delivery problems. Good use of audio-visual presentations.	Some difficulty communicating ideas due to problems with voice projection, language, or lack of eye contact. Weak use of audio-visual presentations.	Ideas are not clear. Poor use of audio-visual presentations.
Quality of Comments	Comments advance the level and depth of the dialogue (consistently).	Comments occasionally advance the level and depth of the dialogue.	When/where prepared, makes relevant comments based on the assigned material.	Demonstrates a noticeable lack of interest in the material.
<b>Overall Impact (30%)</b>				
Impact on Group Dynamic	Group dynamic and level of discussion are consistently better because of the student's presence.	Group dynamic and level of discussion are often better because of the student's presence.	Group dynamic and level of discussion are occasionally better (and never worse) because of the student's presence.	Group dynamic and level of discussion are harmed (perhaps significantly) by the student's presence.

## **Guide to differentiating between the letters**

- A+ level work is truly exceptional. It is objectively superior to what could have been fairly expected and has caused the entire group to think, or see an issue — at least temporarily — in a new way. If members of the group would be surprised that their colleague had received an A+, then that grade is not deserved.
- A/A– level work is clearly superior. The assessor must be absolutely convinced that had this particular student not been present for the discussion, the quality of the learning experience for the entire group would have been inferior.
- B+ and C+ level work should be reserved for students who are capable of exhibiting A-like qualities but fail to do so in a consistent manner. A student who makes a generally consistent, predictable and certainly acceptable contribution but also demonstrates occasional flashes of brilliance would receive a grade of B+. A relatively unprepared student who demonstrates an occasional flash of brilliance would receive a grade of C+.
- The grade B– is reserved for those instances when the assessor cannot be certain whether the faults in performance at the analytical level should be attributed to a lack of effort or a sincere misunderstanding.
- The grade C– is reserved for students who have achieved the absolute bare minimum during the seminar.
- F-level work objectively does not fulfill the requirements or goals of the seminar. There should be absolutely no hesitancy when it comes to the grade F. If there is, the student's performance in the seminar should be awarded a D.