



MLDC Research Areas

Definition of Diversity
Legal Implications
Outreach & Recruiting
Leadership & Training
Branching & Assignments
Promotion
Retention
Implementation & Accountability
Metrics
National Guard & Reserve

This issue paper aims to aid in the deliberations of the MLDC. It does not contain the recommendations of the MLDC.

Military Leadership Diversity Commission
1851 South Bell Street
Arlington, VA 22202
(703) 602-0818

<http://mldc.whs.mil/>

Department of Defense Directive 1020.02 A Foundation for Effective, Accountable Diversity Management?

Abstract

The MLDC was tasked with assessing the abilities of DoD and the Services to ensure “effective and accountable” diversity management. On February 5, 2009, DoD issued DoD Directive (DoDD) 1020.02, its primary policy statement about diversity and diversity management. This issue paper describes DoDD 1020.02 and considers the extent to which it establishes a foundation for effective and accountable diversity management. Based on an analysis of the diversity- and diversity management-related sections of the directive, we conclude that it is a good first step because it effectively distinguishes diversity and diversity management from military equal opportunity (MEO) and civilian equal employment opportunity (EEO) by tying the definitions of diversity and diversity management and the diversity management program goals to improved readiness and capability, not to fairness and the prevention of illegal discrimination. We also note, however, that the directive’s internal tensions may undermine the establishment of diversity management as a separate effort. In particular, the purpose statement of the directive ties diversity management to the prevention of unlawful discrimination, but the overarching policy statement ties MEO and EEO to capability enhancement. The directive also provides only a little information on implementation specifics. This is where the MLDC may make its most valuable contribution by providing informed recommendations for how to put diversity management into practice. An important area on which to focus is measuring outcomes because the ability to tie diversity management to the stated goal of enhanced mission readiness may be the ultimate determinant of the success and credibility of the DoD diversity management program.

The MLDC charter tasks the commission with assessing the abilities of the Department of Defense (DoD) and the Services to ensure “effective and accountable” diversity management. On February 5, 2009—about four months after the passage of legislation establishing the MLDC—DoD released a new directive that defines diversity management and assigns responsibility for the oversight and implementation of diversity management efforts within the department. Department of Defense Directive (DoDD) 1020.02, “Diversity Management and Equal Opportunity (EO) in the Department of Defense,” is now DoD’s primary policy statement about diversity and diversity management.

This issue paper (IP) summarizes and discusses the directive’s key provisions regarding diversity management to help the commissioners consider the extent to which the directive establishes a foundation for effective and accountable diversity management. The IP does not directly address the directive’s provisions regarding EO programs.

The Structure of DoDD 1020.02

DoDD 1020.02 has seven sections:

- 1) Purpose
- 2) Applicability
- 3) Definitions
- 4) Policy
- 5) Responsibilities
- 6) Releasability¹
- 7) Effective Date.²

Consistent with the title of the directive, each section’s subsections apply to diversity management and/or equal opportunity—either Military Equal Opportunity (MEO) or Civilian Equal Employment Opportunity (EEO). The “key provisions” addressed in this IP are the subsections of sections 1, 3, 4, and 5 that relate to diversity management.

Regarding section 2, Applicability, we note that this Directive applies broadly to all DoD “components,” including the Office of the Secretary of Defense (OSD), the military departments, and the combatant commands.³ It does not, however, apply to the Department of Homeland Security, to which the Coast Guard belongs.

The complete text of DoDD 1020.02 is available on the MLDC website in the “Readings” section under the “Resources” tab.⁴

Purpose

Under the leadership of the Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness (USD(P&R)), DoDD 1020.02 was written iteratively over the course of two years by members of the Defense Diversity Working Group (DDWG) and the Office of Diversity Management and Equal Opportunity (ODMEO). The original intent of the directive was to institutionalize diversity management as a separate addition to longer-standing equal opportunity programs and establish policies for diversity programs to keep the Service diversity offices and DoD on the same course (Military Leadership Diversity Commission, 2009b). In its final form, the purpose statement of the directive says that it:

Establishes policy, assigns responsibilities, and provides an overarching framework for DoD diversity, military EO, and civilian equal employment opportunity (EEO) programs and plans to prevent unlawful discrimination. (U.S. Department of Defense, 2009, section 1a).

This statement raises two key questions for the MLDC as it considers the functional and organizational relationships between diversity/diversity management and MEO/EEO. The first question is whether placing the two programs within the same framework can adequately take into account the differences between them and successfully institutionalize diversity as a separate effort. On one hand, an important motivation behind the Services’ decisions to develop their diversity definitions was a perceived organizational need to distinguish diversity and diversity management from MEO and EEO (Military Leadership Diversity Commission, 2010c). On the other hand, a good EO climate is typically seen as a necessary, though not sufficient, condition for a good diversity climate.⁵ To the extent that the latter is true, strong, well-functioning EO programs may be important for the establishment of the diversity management program, even when diversity management stands as a separate effort.

The second question relates to the wording of the statement. Specifically, to what extent do diversity and equal opportunity programs share the common purpose of preventing unlawful discrimination? At this stage, most conceptions of diversity and diversity management do not include prevention of discrimination as a goal.⁶ More importantly, as will be seen in the next section, the definition of diversity management provided in the directive itself ties diversity management to

enhanced capability, not to discrimination prevention. In addition, the directive’s definition of diversity is quite broad, implicitly including characteristics and attributes that are not protected by law. Thus, there is internal tension within the directive itself.

Definitions

The directive defines the following terms: *civilian EEO*, *diversity*, *diversity management*, *MEO*, and *nondiscrimination in federally assisted or federally conducted programs*. The relevant definitions for this IP are the diversity-related definitions: “Diversity. The different characteristics and attributes of individuals” (U.S. Department of Defense, 2009, section 3b) and “Diversity management. The plans made and programs undertaken to identify in the aggregate the diversity within the Department of Defense to enhance DoD capabilities and achieve mission readiness” (U.S. Department of Defense, 2009, section 3c).

One of the MLDC charter tasks explicitly directs the commission to examine the development of a diversity definition to be used uniformly throughout DoD. Since DoDD 1020.02 was released after the MLDC charter was written, it is now necessary for the commission to consider whether to recommend accepting the definition provided in the directive or to recommend a new definition.⁷

The MLDC charter does not request the development of a diversity management definition. However, to fulfill its mandate to assess DoD’s and the Services’ abilities to ensure effective, accountable diversity management, the commission must have in mind some notion of what effective, accountable diversity management is intended to achieve. Based on the directive’s definition, the implied objective of diversity management is to enhance DoD capabilities and achieve mission readiness, not to guard against illegal discrimination. Fulfilling the charter task also requires some notion of what effective, accountable diversity management should entail.

The directive’s definition of diversity management suggests a narrow set of activities: only *identifying* the diversity within DoD that can enhance the department’s capabilities and help achieve mission readiness. As the commission considers which diversity programs and policies to recommend and how to hold leadership accountable for implementation, it may want to consider whether the directive’s definition of diversity management implies the appropriate goal and range of activities.

Both the Services’ diversity statements and the empirical literature on diversity in the private-sector workforce suggest that enhanced organizational capability is the right goal for diversity management (Military Leadership Diversity Commission, 2009a, 2010a, 2010c). However, diversity management programs, policies, and practices in the private sector suggest that the range of activities that constitute diversity management is wider than simply identifying which types of diversity matter. Specifically, civilian practices indicate

that diversity management entails the following: forming and implementing policies and following practices designed to recruit, develop, retain, and lead a demographically diverse workforce to the benefit of the organization (Military Leadership Diversity Commission, 2010f, 2010g). Note that, although the civilian approach to diversity management entails a wider range of activities, it is focused on a narrower, demographics-based set of diversity attributes.

Policy

Section 4, Policy, includes both a general policy statement and specific policies for the diversity management, MEO, and EEO programs and for the DoD Program to Prohibit Unlawful Discrimination in Federally Assisted or Federally Conducted Activities. The general policy statement defines the overarching framework that applies to all four programs, and the diversity management policies give the first guidance regarding the *implementation* of the DoD and Service-specific diversity management programs.

The General Policy Statement

The directive's general policy statement provides a diversity/diversity management and MEO/EEO framework with two components:

The defense of the Nation requires a well-trained volunteer force, military and civilian, Active and Reserve. To provide such a force, the Department of Defense must ensure the attractiveness of a DoD career, providing opportunities for all DoD personnel to rise to as high a level of responsibility as their abilities allow. In doing so, the Department of Defense must maximize the productive capacity represented in the diversity of those recruited, hired, developed, and promoted. (U.S. Department of Defense, 2009, section 4a).

The first component addresses the need to attract a high-quality workforce in sufficient numbers. This is a basic readiness requirement. It also suggests that the way to attract such a workforce is to provide advancement opportunities for everyone who merits them. Because of its reference to merit-based opportunity for all personnel, this first component may seem to be entirely MEO/EEO focused.⁸ It is, however, consistent with demographics-based business case arguments for diversity, which say that organizations that successfully attract and retain women and minorities will gain a competitive advantage in the labor market because those groups are increasing their share of the workforce (Military Leadership Diversity Commission, 2010a). A corollary to this argument is that visible opportunities to advance affect the recruitment and retention of women and minorities.⁹

The second component of the framework goes beyond the basic requirement for recruiting and retaining an adequately sized, high-quality workforce, saying that the department must

ensure that the workforce can reach its greatest productive capability. This focus on capability is consistent with the directive's definition of diversity management, which, as already noted, is consistent with the Services' diversity statements and the superior-outcomes business-case arguments for diversity and diversity management efforts.

Does this framework take into account the differences between diversity/diversity management and MEO/EEO in a way that will successfully institutionalize diversity as a separate effort? With elements of both diversity/diversity management and MEO/EEO, the first component of the framework does not emphasize the differences between the two types of programs. Nor, however, does it force them to be the same. The second component of the framework appears to ascribe to MEO/EEO a goal that is more appropriately associated with diversity/diversity management efforts. This contrasts with the directive's purpose statement, which ascribed to diversity plans and programs a goal (i.e., prevention of unlawful discrimination) that is more properly associated with MEO/EEO. Thus, again, the directive contains internal tensions and ambiguities regarding the ultimate goals of the two types of programs.

Diversity Management Policies

The diversity management program defined in DoDD 1020.02 has the following five elements, stated in terms of what the program should do:

- 1) Encourage DoD organizations to value diversity, thus establishing a DoD culture that values inclusion of all DoD personnel, military and civilian, as part of the DoD team and views diversity throughout the workforce as a potential force multiplier in DoD mission accomplishment.
- 2) Ensure that all military and civilian personnel understand they are valued; ensure they are able to achieve their full potential while contributing to accomplishment of the DoD mission.
- 3) Establish training, mentoring, and development approaches that ensure all DoD personnel have the skills to navigate career progression successfully.
- 4) Provide culturally aware training and appropriate assistance to enhance organizational capabilities.
- 5) Develop management systems that measure and report diversity management and EO progress. (U.S. Department of Defense, 2009, sections 4c(1)–4c(5)).

Program elements (1) and (2) are about creating a positive, inclusive diversity climate in the service of mission accomplishment. The importance of climate and its role in creating mission-related diversity benefits is discussed in several IPs.¹⁰ Program element (3) is about providing tools for personnel to manage their own career progression. At first glance, this part of the program may appear to be more about MEO/EEO than diversity management. However, comparing the language in this section with the language in the sections defining the MEO and EEO programs shows

that MEO and EEO are about identifying and removing barriers to advancement at the organization level, rather than providing tools that allow individual members to proactively manage their careers.¹¹ Program element (4) appears to call for training that will help personnel generate capability benefits from diversity.¹² The IP on effective diversity leadership describes key practices and tools that individual leaders can use to do this in their units and workgroups (Military Leadership Diversity Commission, 2010e).

Program element (5) gets to the heart of the implementation and accountability issue by requiring measurement of and reporting on the progress of the diversity management program toward its goals. To satisfy this program requirement, there are two types of measurement and reporting that can be done: first, documenting what activities are being undertaken and noting that they are consistent with the program's goals and, second, tracking the outcomes of those activities using metrics that are goal appropriate.

The four substantive parts of the diversity management program suggest at least three outcomes to be monitored. The first is the diversity climate. Using multiple survey instruments, the Services and DoD are already doing this under various efforts (Military Leadership Diversity Commission, 2010k). The second outcome is the extent to which career development programs adequately prepare personnel to manage their career progression. The IP on the career development resources provided by the Services indicates that these resources are extensive but that there has been no systematic effort to evaluate their effectiveness, either overall or for specific demographic groups (Military Leadership Diversity Commission, 2010i). Demographic differences in retention and promotion rates are also indirect, but bottom-line, indicators of both the diversity climate and the extent to which personnel of all demographic backgrounds are able to successfully manage their career progression. These outcomes should be tracked as part of the MEO and EEO programs.¹³

The third outcome is the extent to which diversity is being managed to enhance capability and serve as a force multiplier. This is the most difficult outcome to measure: Mission capability and readiness are difficult to quantify, and attributing improvements in them directly to diversity management will be even harder still. Demonstrably tying diversity management to capability may, however, be necessary for establishing the credibility of the program, given its stated goals.¹⁴

A potentially problematic aspect of program element (5) is the reference to EO. There is a similar, mirroring reference to "promoting diversity" in the section on the civilian EEO program: "The DoD Civilian EEO Program shall develop and implement programs to promote diversity and ensure EEO in the DoD" (U.S. Department of Defense, 2009, section 4d(2)). These two intermingled references to EO and diversity threaten to undermine the establishment of diversity management as a separate program. More

generally, however, the diversity management program's focus on mission enhancement (rather than discrimination prevention) and proactive career management (rather than barrier removal) creates a distinction between it and the MEO and EEO programs.

Finally, a common feature of all five elements of the diversity management program defined by the directive is that they tell implementers *what* the program should do but not *how* to do it. Thus, a key question for the commission to consider is whether to recommend issuance of specific Instructions to flesh out the details of how to comply with the directive. (Consistent with its oversight responsibilities, OSD is in the process of drafting implementing Instructions.)¹⁵

Responsibilities

Section 5, Responsibilities, assigns duties for policy and program implementation to USD(P&R) and to the heads of the DoD components.¹⁶ Although the directive does not explicitly discuss accountability, presumably, it assigns it in accord with responsibility.

USD(P&R)

The directive delegates oversight of the diversity management, civilian EEO, and MEO programs to USD(P&R). In this capacity, USD(P&R) is assigned six responsibilities, three of which are especially relevant to accountability issues related to the diversity management program:

- (1b) "Ensure full implementation of this directive and monitor progress toward program objectives."
- (1c) "Issue implementing issuances, as required and in accordance with Reference (e) [DoD Instruction 5025.01], to achieve the objectives of these programs and to provide policy direction and overall guidance to the DoD Components."
- (1f) "Serve as the primary liaison for coordinating policies, programs, and initiatives for related programs among the Military Departments, the Joint Staff, and Washington Headquarters Services, who shall be responsible for dissemination and coordination with the Components within OSD, Defense Agencies, and DoD Field Activities." (U.S. Department of Defense, 2009, section 1).

Provisions (1b) and (1c) are essentially about compliance: Provision (1b) addresses USD(P&R)'s responsibility to *ensure* that the DoD components comply with the policies laid out in the directive; provision (1c) addresses USD(P&R)'s responsibility to provide additional guidance—either in terms of policy direction or implementation specifics—that will *enable* the components to comply with the directive.

The issue of compliance raises three important questions. First, how will USD(P&R) evaluate implementation and progress? As noted earlier, assessing the implementation and measuring the progress of diversity management programs should be a multidimensional process and may not be straightforward; tying diversity management to the stated goal of enhanced capability will be particularly difficult. In addition,

when considering how USD(P&R) will monitor the programs of all three military departments and other agencies, a key concern is how much uniformity to impose, in terms of both program content and the measuring and reporting of outcomes.

Second, how will USD(P&R) ensure compliance with the directive? In particular, what will, or should, be the consequences of nonimplementation, nonreporting, or lack of progress toward program objectives?

Third, what additional Instructions, if any, should be issued to clarify how the diversity management program should be implemented? (This question also arose in the discussion of the diversity management program.) Many of the IPs, including some of those that have already been referenced, can inform the commission's potential recommendations on these questions.

Finally, provision (1f) addresses USD(P&R)'s role as a coordinator and liaison. To some extent, USD(P&R) is already fulfilling this responsibility via the DDWG, which is led by ODMEO's diversity manager and is composed of representatives from the four DoD Services (typically, the diversity managers for each Service).¹⁷

DoD Component Heads

The directive makes the component heads responsible for ensuring that their individual programs are implemented in accordance with its provisions. It assigns them five specific responsibilities, four of which are relevant to diversity management. Specifically, the directive stipulates that the heads of the DoD Components shall:

(2a) "Ensure that all their internal DoD diversity management, civilian EEO, and MEO program policies are disseminated widely, understood, and implemented at all levels within their Components."

(2c) "Treat the DoD Diversity Management, Civilian EEO, and MEO Programs as essential elements of readiness that are vital to the accomplishment of the national security mission."

(2d) "Ensure programs are managed by officials senior enough to have direct access to the Component Head to ensure visibility and priority for Diversity Management, MEO, and Civilian EEO programs and assign sufficient staff and resources to assure viable programs."

(2e) "Require that support for and contributions to these policies and programs be considered in the annual performance plans of all supervisors, managers, commanders, and other DoD Component personnel, both military and civilian, having program responsibilities." (U.S. Department of Defense, 2009, section 2).

Charging the component heads with ultimate responsibility for their organizations' diversity management programs is consistent with both the empirical literature regarding diversity in civilian workforces and actual private-sector practices: Active involvement at the highest levels is considered crucial to the success of any diversity management program (Military Leadership Diversity Commission, 2010a, 2010g). The specific responsibilities listed in the

directive—essentially, communicating program content, setting priorities, and holding people accountable—are also consistent with the role of leadership in instituting organizational change (Military Leadership Diversity Commission, 2010d).

Requiring the managers of the diversity management programs to be senior and to have direct access to the component heads is also consistent with private-sector practices (Military Leadership Diversity Commission, 2010d, 2010g), and, as noted in the directive's language, it is an important symbol of the priority placed on the programs. It is also a way to ensure that the component heads are indeed taking responsibility for the programs' success. Currently, the Services differ in terms of both the rank of the diversity manager (the Army's diversity manager is the only diversity manager wearing a star) and the distance between the diversity manager and the component head (however, none of the Services' diversity managers reports directly to the component head).¹⁸

This list of responsibilities for Component Heads, like the list for USD(P&R), also raises questions about actual implementation and accountability.

Regarding (2a), a key issue is how to talk about diversity and diversity management. Research has found that military personnel do not have a common language for talking about either concept. In particular, most people think about diversity and diversity management in terms of demographic characteristics and fairness, both of which are more appropriately associated with MEO/EEO.¹⁹

Regarding (2c), framing diversity management as mission essential is likely to be fundamental to the success of the diversity management program. As noted in the IP on the business-case arguments, diversity must be managed (i.e., led), diversity tools must be provided, and *there must be agreement that the benefits are worth the investment* (Military Leadership Diversity Commission, 2010a). Thus, the question is how to demonstrate that diversity management can, in fact, enhance mission capability and readiness.

Regarding (2e), it is clear that personnel at all levels must be held accountable for supporting the diversity management program. However, it is not clear exactly what behavior is being sought (at what levels in the hierarchy) or how to monitor such behavior. Nevertheless, the Services have begun to incorporate diversity elements into their performance plans and evaluations. The Navy's fitness report for senior enlisted personnel contains a rating on character that includes recognition of diversity. A rating of 5 (the highest) is given to an individual who "develops unit cohesion by valuing differences as strengths" and "seamlessly integrates diversity into all aspects of the command" (U.S. Navy, Bureau of Naval Personnel, 2008). A rating of 1 (the lowest) is given to an individual who "demonstrates exclusionary behavior" and "fails to value differences from cultural diversity" (U.S. Navy, Bureau of Naval Personnel, 2008). Supervisors must explain and document high and low ratings. In another approach, the Coast Guard system requires officers to write about their

their personal contributions to furthering the Coast Guard diversity plan.²⁰ The IP on private-sector diversity management practices also identifies several examples of expected behavioral change and ways to monitor it (Military Leadership Diversity Commission, 2010g).

Summary

This IP presented and commented on the diversity-related subsections of sections 1, 3, 4, and 5 of DoDD 1020.02. The main points of these sections can be summarized as follows:

- *Section 1, Purpose.* The purpose of the directive is to bring diversity management, MEO, and EEO together under one framework *with the prevention of unlawful discrimination as the goal.*
- *Section 3, Definitions.* The definitions of diversity and diversity management lay the groundwork for separating diversity management from MEO and EEO: The definition of diversity is much broader than the characteristics covered by the law, and diversity management is about enhancing mission capability and readiness.
- *Section 4, Policy.* The general policy statement defines the common framework for diversity management and MEO/EEO. It incorporates notions of both but *emphasizes enhanced capability as the goal.* The policy that defines the diversity management program distinguishes diversity management from MEO and EEO by its focus on mission enhancement versus discrimination prevention and on proactive career management versus barrier removal.
- *Section 5, Responsibilities.* The directive assigns primary oversight responsibility to USD(P&R) and delegates to the component heads responsibility for implementing their organizations' diversity management programs. Vesting responsibility for diversity management at the highest levels of leadership is consistent with both the empirical literature regarding diversity in civilian workforces and actual private-sector practices.

The review of DoDD 1020.02 also raised several questions regarding the implementation of the diversity management programs:

- What activities does diversity management entail?
- How will USD(P&R) and the component heads evaluate implementation and progress toward program goals? In particular, how can diversity management be tied to improved organizational climate and, especially, improved capability and readiness?
- How will USD(P&R) ensure compliance with the directive?
- How will people be held accountable for supporting and contributing to diversity management programs?
- What, if any, additional Instructions should be issued to provide more guidance on implementation? In particular, how much uniformity in both program content and reporting procedures should be required across the Services?

Conclusion

Key provisions of the DoDD 1020.02 effectively distinguish diversity and diversity management from MEO and EEO by tying the definitions of diversity and diversity management and the diversity management program goals to improved readiness and capability, not to fairness and the prevention of illegal discrimination. Thus, the directive is a good first step toward establishing a foundation for effective and accountable diversity management.

However, the directive's internal tensions and ambiguities may undermine the establishment of diversity management as a separate effort. Specifically, the purpose statement of the directive ties diversity management to the prevention of unlawful discrimination, but the overarching policy statement ties EEO and MEO to capability enhancement. In addition, there is a reference to EO in the diversity management policy and there is a reference to diversity in the EEO policy.

Because the directive provides little information on implementation specifics, there are unanswered questions regarding how the diversity management program will be implemented across the Services. This is where the MLDC may make its most valuable contribution by providing informed recommendations for how to put diversity management into practice. An important area on which to focus is measuring outcomes. In particular, the ability to actually tie diversity management to the stated goal of enhanced mission readiness may be the ultimate determinant of the success and credibility of the diversity management program defined in the directive.

Notes

¹The directive is approved for public release.

²The directive was effective immediately upon its release.

³The other DoD components specified in section 2 are the Office of the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the Joint Staff, the DoD Office of the Inspector General, the defense agencies, the DoD field activities, and all other organizational entities within DoD.

⁴The directive is also available on the DoD issuances website (<http://www.dtic.mil/whs/directives>).

⁵For example, informational meetings conducted for this commission communicated clearly that servicemember trust in fairness is a prerequisite for turning diversity into mission capability (Military Leadership Diversity Commission, 2010b).

⁶Although the Services acknowledge different rationales for diversity, they all have mission readiness as a goal (Military Leadership Diversity Commission, 2010c). "Superior-outcomes" business-case arguments for diversity efforts assert that well-managed and well-led diversity can improve such organizational outcomes as innovation and creativity (Military Leadership Diversity Commission, 2010a).

⁷Two IPs (Military Leadership Diversity Commission, 2009a, 2010c) address the definition task directly and pose three more specific questions:

- Should the DoD definition of diversity focus on attributes, climate, or both (Military Leadership Diversity Commission, 2009a)?
- Should a list of attributes defined as diverse be as broad as the Services and DoD currently define them or as narrow as the MLDC charter implies (Military Leadership Diversity Commission, 2009a)?
- Will the proposed DoD definition be congruent with the Services' diversity statements (Military Leadership Diversity Commission, 2009c)?

⁸Civilian EEO and MEO are defined as follows:

Civilian EEO. The right of all covered persons to work and advance on the basis of merit, ability, and potential, free from social, personal, or institutional barriers of prejudice or discrimination based unlawfully on race, sex, color, national origin, age, religion, disability, reprisal, marital status, sexual orientation, status as a parent, political affiliation, or other prohibited non-merit factors as prohibited [by law] (U.S. Department of Defense, 2009, section 3a).

MEO. The right of all military personnel to participate in and benefit from programs and activities for which they are qualified. These programs and activities shall be free from social, personal, or institutional barriers that prevent people from rising to the highest level of responsibility possible (U.S. Department of Defense, 2009, section 3d).

⁹The framework's first component is also consistent with traditional approaches to personnel management in the military. Indeed, one of the purposes of the 1947 Officer Personnel Act (OPA)—passed long before the first EEO legislation—was to “authorize a grade distribution that would provide a sufficiently attractive career so that high-caliber people would be attracted to service” (Rostker, Thie, Lacy, Kawata, & Purnell, 1993). Similarly, a key goal of the 1980 Defense Officer Personnel Management Act (the modern successor to OPA) was to create a personnel management system to “provide career opportunities that would attract and retain the number of officers of high caliber needed” (see Rostker et al., 1993).

¹⁰The IP on business-case arguments for diversity describes the positive impact of a healthy diversity climate on retention (Military Leadership Diversity Commission, 2010a), and the IP on effective diversity leadership says that developing an inclusive environment is an important role for leaders at all levels. Specifically, it notes that inclusion preserves and leverages individual differences to enhance capability and that key elements of a positive diversity climate are leader-dependent (Military Leadership Diversity Commission, 2010e). Finally, the IP on internal private-sector practices notes that it is important for supervisors to support upper leadership's diversity statements and organization-level diversity policies with actions that embrace inclusion (Military Leadership Diversity Commission, 2010f).

¹¹IPs on the Services' mentoring programs (Military Leadership Diversity Commission, 2010h), career development resources (Military Leadership Diversity Commission, 2010i), and servicemembers' knowledge and perceptions of the promotion system (Military Leadership Diversity Commission, 2010j) address the extent to which the Services are doing this now and whether the current activities and tools are equally effective for all members, regardless of race, ethnicity, or gender.

¹²There may be other ways to interpret this part of the diversity management program (i.e., section 4c(4)). Absent additional information regarding the actual intent of this provision, this is our operating interpretation.

¹³DoDD 1350.2 requires each DoD component to submit an annual MEO assessment (MEOA) that reports on, among other things, demographic differences in promotions, retention, and assignments. It should also be noted, however, that compliance with this directive has been lacking: The last MEOA report, submitted in 2004, summarized data for fiscal year 2002.

¹⁴Case studies on the impact of diversity leadership in Air Force squadrons provide an example of one approach to addressing this assessment issue (Kraus & Riche, 2009).

¹⁵Department of Defense Office of Diversity Management and Equal Opportunity, Director, Military Equal Opportunity (personal communication, May 24, 2010).

¹⁶The specifics of section 5 are listed in Enclosure 2 of the directive.

¹⁷The DDWG is the primary collaboration and execution body for diversity management in the DoD. It meets quarterly, and its main objectives are to synchronize the efforts of the Services by establishing common diversity goals and policies and to provide a forum in which the Services can share best practices (Military Leadership Diversity Commission, 2009b). There is, however, some indication that records of these meetings are not kept in a way that will enable the storing of institutional memory—a crucial function.

¹⁸Service briefings on organizational structure are available on the MLDC website (<http://mldc.whs.mil/>). See the information in the March 2010 meeting agenda under the “Activities” tab.

¹⁹This research includes interviews and focus groups with Air Force military and civilian personnel (Kraus & Riche, 2009) and MLDC-sponsored informational meetings with members of other Services.

²⁰U.S. Coast Guard Diversity Office (CG-12B) (personal communication, March 2, 2010).

References

- Kraus, A., & Riche, M. F. (2009). *Approaches to and tools for successful diversity management: Results from 360-degree diversity management case studies* [CNA Research Memorandum D0020315.A2]. Alexandria, VA: CNA.
- Military Leadership Diversity Commission. (2009a, December). *Examples of diversity definitions*. [Issue Paper #3]. Arlington, VA: Military Leadership Diversity Commission.
- Military Leadership Diversity Commission. (2009b, December). *The Defense Diversity Working Group*. [Issue Paper #7]. Arlington, VA: Military Leadership Diversity Commission.
- Military Leadership Diversity Commission. (2010a, February). *Business-case arguments for diversity and diversity programs and their impact in the workplace*. [Issue Paper #14]. Arlington, VA: Military Leadership Diversity Commission.
- Military Leadership Diversity Commission. (2010b, March). *Perceptions of diversity and diversity leadership within the services*. [Issue Paper #18]. Arlington, VA: Military Leadership Diversity Commission.
- Military Leadership Diversity Commission. (2010c, March). *Services' processes for developing definitions of diversity and diversity policy statements*. [Issue Paper #20]. Arlington, VA: Military Leadership Diversity Commission.
- Military Leadership Diversity Commission. (2010d, March). *Change as a process: What business management can tell us about instituting new diversity initiatives*. [Issue Paper #21]. Arlington, VA: Military Leadership Diversity Commission.
- Military Leadership Diversity Commission. (2010e, April). *Effective diversity leadership: Definition and practices*. [Issue Paper #29]. Arlington, VA: Military Leadership Diversity Commission.
- Military Leadership Diversity Commission. (2010f, June). *Demographic diversity management policies, practices, and metrics used in private sector organizations: External initiatives* [Issue Paper #48]. Arlington, VA: Military Leadership Diversity Commission.
- Military Leadership Diversity Commission. (2010g, June). *Demographic diversity management policies, practices, and metrics used in private sector organizations: Individual leader initiatives and internal company initiatives* [Issue Paper #49]. Arlington, VA: Military Leadership Diversity Commission.

Military Leadership Diversity Commission. (2010h, April). *Mentoring programs across the Services* [Issue Paper # 33]. Arlington, VA: Military Leadership Diversity Commission.

Military Leadership Diversity Commission. (2010i, May). *Career development resources in the Services* [Issue Paper #38]. Arlington, VA: Military Leadership Diversity Commission.

Military Leadership Diversity Commission. (2010j, May). *Knowledge and perceptions of promotion within the Services* [Issue Paper #43]. Arlington, VA: Military Leadership Diversity Commission.

Military Leadership Diversity Commission. (2010k, June). *Measuring service climate with an eye for diversity* [Issue Paper #42]. Arlington, VA: Military Leadership Diversity Commission.

Rostker, B., Thie, H. J., Lacy, J. L., Kawata, J. H., & Purnell, S. W. (1993). *The Defense Officer Personnel Management Act of 1980: A retrospective assessment* [National Defense Research Institute R-4246-FMP]. Santa Monica, CA: RAND Corporation.

U.S. Department of Defense. (2009, February 5). *Diversity management and equal opportunity (EO) in the Department of Defense* [DoDD 1020.02].

U.S. Navy, Bureau of Naval Personnel. (2008, July 9). *Navy Performance Evaluation System* [BUPERS Instruction 1610.10B]. Millington, TN: Bureau of Naval Personnel.