 DOI: 10.3849/2336-2995.35.2026.01.003-018

Peer-reviewed

Operations Planning as Part of the Officers´ Career Training

Plánování operací jako součást kariérové přípravy důstojníků

Richard Saibert[1], Vlastimil Drápela[1]

[1]University of Defence, Brno, Czech Republic

Abstract: The article examines the possibilities of developing the competencies of the Czech Armed Forces (CAF) officers in the field of operations planning within the framework of career training. The main learning competencies for operations planning at the operational level are formulated based on a comparison of curricula of professional military education programmes and interviews with experts. These are together with the proposed assessment methods, validated in a real learning process. Different approaches to assessing learning outcomes are discussed in comparison with the current approaches applied in Czech career education, which highlights the need for an innovative approach to assessment. Based on the research results, the paper presents a proposal for an assessment standard, including methods for learning outcomes evaluation.

Abstrakt: Článek zkoumá možnosti rozvoje kompetencí důstojníků Armády České republiky v oblasti plánování operací v rámci kariérové přípravy. Na základě analýzy kurikul profesionálního vojenského vzdělávání a konzultací s experty byly stanoveny klíčové učební kompetence pro plánování operací na operační úrovni. Spolu s navrženými metodami hodnocení byly následně validovány v reálném vzdělávacím procesu. V rámci diskuse jsou debatovány různé přístupy k hodnocení studijních výsledků v porovnání s dosavadními přístupy uplatňovanými v rámci českého kariérového vzdělávání, což zdůrazňuje potřebu inovace přístupu k hodnocení. Na základě výsledků výzkumu článek přináší návrh hodnotícího standardu, včetně metod hodnocení výsledků učení.

Keywords: Comprehensive Operations Planning Directive; Operational level; Competencies.

Klíčová slova: Směrnice pro komplexní plánování operací; operační úroveň; kompetence.

INTRODUCTION

Effective conduct of operations requires the ability to respond rapidly to a complex and dynamically changing security environment. This aspect is particularly pertinent when applied to modern multi-domain operations, which require an accelerated and coordinated decision-making process at the strategic, operational, and tactical levels across all operational domains (Petráš 2023, 70). Emphasis should be placed on the ability to coordinate activities across all domains and collaborate with different actors. In that respect, the development of operations planning competencies is a must.

Professional military education (PME) represents one of the ways to promote a shared framework among those involved in the application of operational art, including the operations planning process (OPP). Military professionals involved in decision-making should study together in professional courses if they are to work together effectively in practice (Spišák 2015, 141). Career courses play an important role in preparing officers for these challenging tasks. Officers learn to assess situations, develop suitable solutions, and formulate decisions through theoretical instruction and practical exercises. An assessment system should allow the identification of their strengths and areas for further improvement.

The paper seeks to offer proposals and recommendations that support the advancement of career education for Czech Armed Forces officers, specifically in the area of operational-level planning.

1 THEORETICAL BACKGROUND

In general, planning can be characterized as a cyclical, goal-oriented process of envisioning the future. It involves different areas and time horizons. In a military environment, the plan is about how to get from unacceptable to acceptable conditions. Military operations planning is implemented at three levels of command and control (NATO Standardization Office 2019)[1]:

1. Strategic Level. The level at which a nation or group of nations determines national or multinational security objectives and deploys national, including military, resources to achieve them.
2. Operational Level. The level at which campaigns and major operations are planned, conducted, and sustained to accomplish strategic objectives within theatres or areas of operations.
3. Tactical Level. The level at which activities, battles, and engagements are planned and executed to accomplish military objectives assigned to tactical formations and units.

1 At the time of publication of this article, a new edition of the doctrine was in the approval process, which, however, does not change the quoted passage in any way.

The output is a plan defining military objectives, strategy, and resources (ends, ways, means). Options (solutions) are established, assessed, and compared. At the strategy level, those are Military Response Options (MRO), at the operational level, Course of Actions (CoA´s) are developed and selected.

CAF's operations planning at the strategic and operational levels is based on the Supreme Allied Commander Europe's (SACEUR) Comprehensive Operations Planning Directive (COPD), adapted to national conditions. The COPD establishes a systematic approach to planning military operations from the strategic to the tactical level and encompasses all phases of operations, from preparation to termination. The planning is divided into six phases to systematically address crises[2].

The paper´s research will be focused only on the phases 1-3 at the operational level according to the COPD, as those are practically trained within the Senior Officers' Career Course (SOC) and Comprehensive Operations Planning Course (COPC) organized by the Centre for Security and Military Strategic Studies (CSMSS). These phases, in terms of required competencies, will be described in the next section.

1.1 Definition of the Concept of Competencies

For the successful implementation of the OPP, officers must have the skills and abilities (competencies) to effectively apply the objectives set out in each stage of the OPP. Well-mastered competencies enable the officer to quickly accomplish tasks, manage complex situations, and achieve objectives, thus contributing to the overall success of operations. The development and strengthening of planning competencies is also given sufficient attention in the Czech Armed Forces Development Concept 2035, which states that "*Operational level of command and control will develop the capability of coordinated, early and synergic engagement by military and non-military instruments, state and non-state actors across operational domains and environments. The tactical echelon will accelerate operations planning and control processes and will develop the capability to coordinate efforts of joint force operations across operational domains.*" These capabilities mentioned above are linked to the planning competencies.

Generally, competency can be characterized as the sum of knowledge, skills, abilities, and other personality characteristics that a person needs to perform well on the job (Procházka, Vaculík, and Smutný 2013, 152). Hroník (2007, 61) defines competency as follows: *„Competency is a bunch of knowledge, skills, experience, and qualities that support the achievement of the goal.*"

Competencies can be categorized according to the degree of generality or transferability. General competencies can be described as transferable skills or general academic skills (educational competencies). These skills are generic to any programme and can be transferred from one context to another. In contrast, core competencies are the most important competencies that a graduate has acquired as a result of completing a specific

2 Comprehensive Operations Planning Directive, version 3.1. 2023.

study programme (Lokhoff, Wegewijs, and Durkin 2021, 22). Each competency should be assessed or verified in some way, which is usually achieved through the development of related learning outcomes. Learning outcomes describe what a student is expected to know, understand, and be able to demonstrate upon successful completion of a course of study (McCauley 2014, 56).

In order to master the first three phases of the COPD process, the officer should have a wide range of professional competencies that enable him/her to quickly analyze the situation, propose solutions, and make decisions in complex conditions.

In the first phase, which focuses on the initial awareness of the crisis, officers should be analytically proficient, be able to identify the main actors and their relationships. Should also be proficient in systems assessment tools such as the PMESII, ASCOPE[3], and DIME[4] frameworks, and be able to assess the causes and consequences of an ongoing crisis. Critical thinking skills and the ability to integrate information from different sources are a great asset at this stage.

In the second phase, which involves an operational appreciation of the strategic environment, the competencies extend to the ability to understand strategic objectives and their implications at the operational level. The officer must be able to interpret strategic documents, such as a strategic assessment and a specific MRO. This requires a systematic approach, the ability to work as part of a team, and to coordinate activities within the planning team. The ability to formulate clear and practical recommendations for strategic decisions is also very important.

In the third phase, which includes operational estimate, the officer should excel in analytical skills, such as factor analysis or centre of gravity analysis. An advantage is the ability to think structurally about CoA and to be able to evaluate them through methods such as a war game. Creativity in finding alternatives and decisiveness in choosing the optimal option are also very important. The officer should also have good communication skills to present and defend proposals convincingly to other members of the planning team or the command.

All in all, it is central to the successful completion of the first three phases of the COPD process that the student combine expertise, analytical thinking, and communication skills with flexibility and the ability to respond quickly to changes.

1.2 Setting and Evaluating the Learning Outcomes

To develop and strengthen officers´ competencies in operations planning, it is essential to define learning outcomes (objectives) and assessment criteria. One of the methods used is founded on the competency-based approach (CBA) to education, where

3 Analytical frameworks for assessment of the operating environment. PMESII – Political, Military, Economy, Information and Infrastructure; ASCOPE – Areas, Structures, Capabilities, Organizations, People and Events.

4 Instruments of power – Diplomatic, Information, Military and Economic.

the learning outcomes are defined as learning competencies. These describe what is to be achieved in the learning process, supporting the development of operations planning competencies. CBA is based on the principle of acquiring and developing competencies in learning individuals rather than on the specific content of a given substance or subject (Veteška 2008, 41). Learning objectives, which are set in the form of situations and tasks to be competently accomplished, should be formulated to be specific, measurable (assessable), attainable, meaningful, and time-bound (Doran 1981, 35).

Assessment is also part of the process to verify that the learning objectives have been met. Defining learning objectives based on CBA gives direction to learning and ensures that it focuses on practical outcomes that are relevant to practice. This approach helps learners to understand better what is required of them and enables teachers to organize learning and evaluate its outcomes.

Taxonomies are useful for differentiating and describing learning content, planning, and verifying learning objectives, such as setting teaching standards. Bloom's Taxonomy is fundamental, defining the structure of educational goals and their connection to different levels of thinking (cognitive complexity levels, hierarchical stages of cognitive processing). It's a key pedagogical theory in curriculum planning. Revised taxonomy (Bloom c2001) includes these categories: Remember, Understand, Apply, Analyze, Evaluate, and Create.

This emphasizes active learning, providing a dynamic framework for educators. When describing learning objectives in the area of operations planning at the operational level within the SOC and the Comprehensive Operations Planning Course (COPC), the categories Create, Evaluate, Apply, and Analyze are used. This is shown in Table 1.

Table 1: Bloom's taxonomy

Category	**Description**	**Active verb for learning outcome definition**
Create	Put elements together to form a coherent or functional whole; reorganize elements into a new arrangement/pattern or structure	design, develop, formulate, investigate, propose
Evaluate	Create assessments based on criteria and standards	justify, argue, select, defend
Analyze	Break down the whole into its basic components and determine which parts belong together, what the overall structure is, and what their purpose is	differentiate, organize, compare, examine, test,
Apply	To perform or apply a procedure in a given situation	execute, implement, solve, use, demonstrate,

There are several approaches and methodologies for evaluating the achievement of competencies or learning objectives.

Summative assessment is the final criterion for assessing students' performance at the end of an educational period. Its main objective is to measure the level of knowledge, skills, and competencies achieved, and to offer an overall overview of the student's performance. This type of assessment focuses on the final result, and its output is usually a numerical rating, a grade, or a percentage score. Typical forms of summative

assessment are final exams, tests, essays, state exams, or certification assessments. It can be said that summative assessment is an exam in the form of a problem-solving activity.

Formative assessment is an ongoing process that helps students improve their learning. Teachers provide feedback to students and help them understand their strengths and weaknesses. This happens at different stages of the lesson, for example, through comments on assignments, tutorials, or reflection after group work. This allows students to engage in their learning and learn how to improve actively.

2 METHODOLOGY

Research aims to explore the possibilities of developing the CAF officers' competencies in operations planning as part of their career preparation. The following research objectives were formulated:

1. Evaluate current approaches to support the development and strengthening of officers´ operations planning competencies within SOC.
2. Formulate learning outcomes at defined phases of the planning process, supporting officers´ competencies in operations planning, including the proposal of an evaluation standard.

For the first research objective, data regarding the course evaluation from the last eight SOCs were collected and assessed[5]. For the competency development, a methodology was established. It comprises the literature review and comparative analysis of the PME curricula, competency development using the Bloom taxonomy, and a validation test for the proposed competency model. For the validation, a method of structured interview with the experts and a validity test within the 70th SOC was used.

Research is limited only to phases 1-3 at the operational level according to the COPD.

3 CURRENT APPROACH TO EVALUATION

Currently, in the SOC, the overall evaluation of the learning area Decision-making at the operational level within the study subject of Military Art consists of three components, which are a knowledge test, student self-assessment, and formative assessment, which is focused on the evaluation of syndicate work.

Notwithstanding, the level of individual student competency in operations planning is assessed only through self-assessment, where respondents express the achievement

5 In the online questionnaire survey, 423 respondents were interviewed, 380 of whom were of the rank of captain and 64 of the rank of senior officer (major and lieutenant colonel). A total of 272 responses (64%) were received.

or acquisition of a given competency. These are formulated as the following learning outcomes:

1. The participant is able to describe the basic characteristics and phases of the NATO OPP at the operational level.
2. The participant has the ability to navigate and apply the outputs (documents) from the NATO strategic level OPP (COPD) to ensure implementation in operational level planning.
3. The participant has the ability to apply operational estimation methods, particularly Center of Gravity analysis and operational scheme development, to define the problem and determine the conditions necessary to achieve the desired end state.
4. The participant has the ability to apply the methods of operations planning, focusing on methods and ways of conducting a war game, the creation of action options, and their comparison, analysis, and selection of options.

Table 2 illustrates the results of the eight-course evaluation for the 2022-2024, supplemented by a knowledge test and by formative assessment. The results are shown in % as a success rate.

Table 2: Results of the 2022-2024 evaluation

SOC – Military art: Decision-making at the operational level	**I. Student self-assessment**				**II. Summative assessment – knowledge test**	**III. Formative assessment – JOPG work**
	quest. 1	**quest. 2**	**quest. 3**	**quest. 4**		
1/2022	73,78 %	68,22 %	63,18 %	59,27 %	73%	100 %
2/2022	81,61 %	74,19 %	70,97 %	72,28 %	94%	100 %
3/2022	80,21 %	68,54 %	67,08 %	59,35 %	91,5%	100 %
1/2023	71,67 %	67,33 %	62,67 %	63,00 %	92%	100 %
2/2023	62,96 %	60,00 %	59,26 %	57,31 %	88,4%	100 %
3/2023	66,67 %	61,00 %	58,67 %	59,33 %	93%	100 %
1/2024	65,48 %	59,68 %	57,10 %	58,06 %	83,3%	100 %
2/2024	72,94 %	71,67 %	70,00 %	70,56 %	86%	100 %
Average	71,92 %	66,33 %	63,62 %	62,40 %	87,65%	100 %

4 OPERATIONS PLANNING COMPETENCY DEVELOPMENT

There are many methods to identify the competencies required for a position, but despite their diversity,"*...the basic phases of competency identification projects remain the same...*" (Krontorád and Trčka 2005, 85). For the development of the military career course curriculum, the basic stages of identifying (learning) competencies are divided into five steps (Štepánek 2019, 14), which are: 1. Preparatory, 2. Data extraction, 3. Analysis and classification of information, 4. Description and development of competencies

and 5. Validation of the resulting model. These steps will be embedded in the following subchapters.

4.1 Literature Review

This preparatory phase was focused on the literature review, specifically the exploration of relevant sources of the possible operations planning competencies. Generally, the elementary source delivers COPD, which gives clear direction on what to do in certain steps of the OPP and provides the basic foundation for any PME in operations planning training. Given the existing PME study programs focused on preparing officers in operations planning, the following curricula and competency register were chosen for analysis and further study[6]:

1. **Sectoral qualifications framework for the military officer profession (SQF MILOF)**
   Learning Area: Operations planning
2. **CSMSS - Senior Officer Course**
   Learning Area: Military art - Decision-making at the operational level
3. **NATO School Oberammergau**
   NATO Comprehensive Operations Planning Course
4. **Baltic Defense College**
   Comprehensive Operational Planning Course
5. **Armed Forces Academy of General Milan Rastislav Štefánik**
   Introduction to the Planning of Joint Operations

The SQF MILOF database serves as a tool for common comparison and classification of PME programmes within the EU. The main objective of the investigation was to compare those curricula with the national military career program (SOC).

4.2 Competency Development

Within a competency development main goal was to develop complex overarching learning competencies for planning phases 1 – 3 according to the COPD. Data retrieved from the different curricula and registers were further systematized and structured. During the analysis and classification of information, a synthesis of relevant learning outcomes was built on the curricula comparison, adding or reformulating active verbs according to the Bloom taxonomy to describe each competency (skill, ability) more accurately and clearly. The last step in this process involved describing and developing learning competencies, which are:

6 The curriculum analysis is available upon request from the author.

Phase 1: Appraise the nature of the situation to contribute to the appreciation of the strategic environment and determine critical factors contributing to the crisis

Phase 2: Understand the strategic situation, the nature of the problem, the desired end state, strategic objectives, including Military Strategic Objectives through Strategic Assessment, provide operational-level advice on the draft strategic MROs, and assess their operational viability.

Phase 3 a: Conduct a thorough analysis of the operational environment to identify critical factors and determine the necessary conditions for achieving the desired end state. Apply the Center of Gravity analysis to identify and understand the critical factors of both friendly and enemy forces.

Phase 3 b: Develop and compare multiple CoAs, utilizing methods such as wargaming, to select the most effective and feasible option. Analyze assigned Operational Objectives and develop Criteria for Success and Conditions to be established.

4.3 Model Validation

This phase is crucial for verifying the relevance and validity of the developed competencies (competency model). The first step consists of conducting a structured interview with experts, both from operations planning and officer training. These interviews were requested to assess whether the competency model adequately reflects the requirements in the operations planning competencies.

A structured interview was conducted with eight respondents. Respondents were asked the following questions:

1. "According to the COPD, what specific competencies should students demonstrate at each phase of OPP?
2. What is your recommendation on how to verify that the analytical methods or outcomes of COPD phases 1-3 are understood by students? At what stages in the process would it be appropriate to provide students with feedback on the issue or to conduct formative or summative assessment?
3. What weight do you give to students' analytical skills compared to their ability to present conclusions?
4. What are the criteria for assessing the results of acquired skills?

Based on the guided interviews, the formulated learning competencies were confirmed, supplemented with specific sub-skills (abilities) formulated as learning objectives that need to be fulfilled, including evaluation. The forms and methods of learning outcome assessment include different approaches to assessing group work at each stage, focusing on the outcome and implementation of the collaboration and the individual contribution of each member.

Evaluation of the result of the group's work includes, in particular, an assessment of the quality of the final presentations. These are evaluated according to predetermined criteria such as accuracy of content, visual design, or communication. In addition to the final product, the teacher/mentor also evaluates the group process, which includes

aspects such as the level of cooperation, the way tasks are divided among group members, and the ability to resolve possible conflicts.

Evaluation of individual contribution emphasizes the student´s specific role and contribution to teamwork. These roles may include, for example, those of JOPG/Syndicate Leader, Analysis Group Leader, or Brainstorming Facilitator. Individual contribution can be further assessed through direct observation, which can use coaching and mentoring. These methods provide students with recommendations, advice, and challenges that support their personal development.

Evaluation methods comprise summative evaluation, which consists of scoring the final results, while formative evaluation includes verbal feedback. This form of assessment enables students to better understand their strengths and areas for improvement and supports them in further learning.

The second step of the model validation phase was its test during the learning process in the 70th SOC[7] (Table 3). This provides an assessment of how the model applies in practice and whether it can predict successful performance. The data collected from the course, for example, participant self-assessment, instructor feedback, and task performance analysis, were compared with the defined competencies. This process of iteratively validating and refining the competency model ensures its validity and relevance. Validation was aimed at assessing the practical skills of the participants in practical exercises according to the proposed methodology.

As part of the syndicate evaluation, within summative evaluation, the score was distributed in the following categories: use of adequate methods and procedures, 40%; terminology, 20%; and relevance of conclusions and ability to defend conclusions, 40%.

Table 3: Competency model validation

Learning objectives	Evaluated output	Evaluation
Evaluate the main actor of the crisis, formulate the key problem, and determine the actors‘ relationship	coaching/mentoring	formative - feedback
Analyze the operating environment according to the PMESII	syndicate briefing	5 pts
Propose recommendations for MRO	syndicate briefing	5 pts
Demonstrate knowledge of strategic planning documents	knowledge test	formative - feedback
Perform a factor analysis	syndicate briefing	5 pts
Define the center of gravity, risks, and design operations scheme	coaching/mentoring	formative - feedback
Prepare and present Mission Analysis Briefing (MBA)	syndicate briefing	15 pts
Develop different CoAs	syndicate briefing	5 pts
Evaluate CoAs; choose and justify the most appropriate CoAs	syndicate briefing	15 pts
Individually contribute to the required efforts within the syndicate for each learning objective	level of involvement in the work	10 pts
Total		60 pts

7 The course consisted of 21 students, of which 7 were in the rank of major and 14 in the rank of captain.

Within the assessment of a learning objective, the same score was always assigned to each syndicate member. Individually, each student was then evaluated on his/her level of involvement in the work.

The results of the validation of the model are divided into two main areas:

I. **Objectivity of evaluation**

- the validity of the evaluation may be affected by assessing students' ability to apply methods and tools they have not used before. The emphasis within each stage should be focused on practice and practical mastery of these methods and tools;
- inability to verifiably assess the involvement of individuals in collaborative work without continuous supervision and monitoring;
- the absence of students from practicing some of the steps and phases has an impact on the assessment of the extent to which they have mastered the understanding of the OPP;
- impossibility to objectively assess the level of engagement of individuals within the syndicate based purely on the evaluation of the final syndicate´s output.

II. **Evaluation criteria**

- setting evaluation criteria depending on the type of output (presentation);
- individual evaluation criteria (quality vs. quantity, etc.);
- distribution of points between the evaluation of the output and the individual (50/10).

5 DISCUSSION

As mentioned in chapter 3 current approach to evaluation of competencies in operations planning in the SOC encompasses both formative and summative evaluation.

Formative assessment applies across subjects where multiple criteria judge students´ work. Effective assessment helps students improve by fostering self-monitoring, understanding high-quality work, objective comparison, and revision. Developing these skills through authentic evaluation experiences is essential (Sadler 1989). Specifically, the outputs of the syndicate's work,[8] such as the preparation of an analysis or presentation, were assessed by providing feedback to students. It can be concluded that all tasks within the syndicate were completed, but regardless of the extent to which individuals were able to understand and apply acquired knowledge and skills.

In terms of individual student evaluation, there are two approaches applied. In the summative assessment, students are evaluated using a knowledge test of the COPD methodology, including concepts, processes, or procedures in operations planning. The results retrieved throughout 2022 – 2024 questionnaires were, on average, 87.65% successful.

With regards to the evaluation of the level of achievement of the competencies through self-assessment, the answers in the observed period have oscillated between

8 Each class syndicate plays role as the Joint Operations Planning Group (JOPG).

62% to 72 %. Student self-assessment has the advantage of being able to be delivered to large classes and is much less time-consuming to provide than a teacher´**s** feedback. A formative self-assessment approach may not only improve students' knowledge and skills on the instructional topic but also foster autonomy and self-determination (Zhang and Desrochers 2023). With proper training, students can assess themselves more accurately. It necessitates training students in self-assessment across subjects and ensuring they understand the criteria used by teachers (Thawabieh 2017).

Based on the above, it may be debatable to what extent the results of the formative evaluation, which focuses on the evaluation of the syndicate, can be taken as determinant in terms of individual evaluation. That is, whether it can be objectively verified that each student acquired the required competencies and can use them correctly. A noticeable discrepancy can be observed in how students perceive themselves and how teachers can evaluate them. This was compounded by the fact that the questions on the ability to apply planning competencies were not in line with the definition of learning outcomes in terms of their wording.

During the validation of the proposed competency model in the 70th SOC, the results of the self-assessment were compared with the summative assessment of the individuals provided by the lecturers. The average self-assessed success rate was 66%, while the summative assessment results show a success rate of 83.3%. Although this is a statistically less significant sample for one course, it can still be concluded that there is a discrepancy between the self-assessment of the course participants and the objective assessment based on the criteria. In this case, this discrepancy can also be attributed to the fact that often the individual's evaluation could not be completely objective, mainly due to the absence of a permanent evaluator for each syndicate.

6 PROPOSALS

Based on the findings, approaches to assessing the achievement of the specified learning outcomes are formulated and categorized according to these areas:

1. **Evaluation of group work**

In this area, it is primarily a formative assessment of the syndicate's work at each phase of the OPP, with an emphasis on the mastery of individual steps, methods, and procedures to achieve the stated planning outcome. Emphasis will be placed on providing feedback on the results of the syndicate's activities using forms of mentoring and coaching.

2. **Evaluation of the individual**

As part of the individual evaluation, students will continue to have the opportunity for self-assessment. It necessitates training students in self-assessment across learning competencies and ensuring they understand the criteria used by lecturers. In that respect, clear and comprehensible criteria that are aligned with learning competencies are needed.

The level of student involvement in the work of the syndicate might be assessed by the mentor as a sub-indicator. This will assess overall contribution to the final product,

communication and collaboration with other team members, and their ability to analyze information and solve problems. Both summative and formative approaches may be used in the assessment.

3. **Final formal evaluation**

The final formal assessment will use a form of quantitative assessment in the form of a practical examination or colloquium, in which the student demonstrates the ability to apply the acquired knowledge and skills in solving a specific task, situation, or problem.

The above-mentioned forms and methods of assessment are further developed into a draft assessment standard (Table 4-7), which illustrates how the described learning outcomes are verified in relation to the defined competencies.

Table 4: Evaluation standard proposal – learning competency 1

1. LEARNING COMPETENCY			
Appraise the nature of the situation to contribute to the appreciation of the strategic environment and determine critical factors contributing to the crisis			
Evaluated skills	Method of verification	Evaluation form	Evaluation criteria
Prepare and provide PMESII analysis/briefing	Practical demonstration in a syndicate exercise	Formative	Provide feedback
Perform System of System Analysis, Actor analysis	Practical exam or colloquium	Summative	Methodology Relevance Terminology
Provide Conflict mapping			

Table 5: Evaluation standard proposal – learning competency 2

2. LEARNING COMPETENCY			
Understand the strategic situation, the nature of the problem, the desired end state, strategic objectives, including Military Strategic Objectives through Strategic Assessment, provide operational-level advice on the draft strategic MROs, and assess their operational viability.			
Evaluated skills	Method of verification	Evaluation form	Evaluation criteria
Propose recommendations for the strategic evaluation of the MRO	Practical demonstration in a syndicate exercise	Formative	Provide feedback
Demonstrated knowledge of strategic planning documents	Test	Summative	Number of points

Table 6: Evaluation standard proposal – learning competency 3 A

3. A LEARNING COMPETENCY			
Conduct a thorough analysis of the operational environment to identify critical factors and determine the necessary conditions for achieving the desired end state. Apply the Center of Gravity analysis to identify and understand the critical factors of both friendly and enemy forces.			
Evaluated skills	Method of verification	Evaluation form	Evaluation criteria

Apply factor analysis	Practical exam or colloquium	Summative	Methodology Relevance Terminology
Identify the enemy's CoG and determine critical capabilities, requirements and vulnerabilities			
Apply risk assessment and management methods			
Apply operational estimation methods during Operation design development	Practical demonstration in a syndicate exercise	Formative	Provide feedback
Prepare and present Mission Analysis Briefing (MAB)			

Table 7: Evaluation standard proposal – learning competency 3 B

3. B LEARNING COMPETENCY			
Develop and compare multiple CoAs, utilizing methods such as wargaming, to select the most effective and feasible option. Analyze assigned Operational Objectives and develop Criteria for Success and Conditions to be established.			
Evaluated skills	Method of verification	Evaluation form	Evaluation criteria
Develop and compare different CoAs	Practical exam or colloquium	Summative	Methodology Relevance Terminology
Evaluate, choose, and justify the most appropriate CoAs	Practical demonstration during war game	Formative	Provide feedback
Prepare and present a Decision briefing on CoAs	Practical demonstration in a syndicate exercise		

CONCLUSION

Although the research was limited only to the issue of operations planning at the operational level, similar recommendations can be made for the strategic level. The limitations of research based on model verification within a single career course alone do not necessarily present a barrier to the formulation of suggestions for approaches to competency assessment.

One of the main suggestions that was verified is the difference between student self-assessment and teacher assessment, regardless of the framework applied for assessment. Self-evaluation should continue to play an important role in the overall assessment, provided that students understand the assessment criteria. Another factor is the emphasis on assessment through feedback so that there is a full understanding of the process in each phase of the planning, and the ability to work collectively within the JOPG.

The next logical step would be to implement the proposed evaluation model in the next career course, to verify it, and possibly further optimize it.

This article was created with the support of the DZRO-CBVSS22-OZKON project implemented by the Center for Security and Military-Strategic Studies of the University of Defense in 2025.

The authors declare that there is no conflict of interest in connection with the publication of this article and that all ethical standards required by the publisher were accepted during its preparation.

REFERENCES

Bloom, Benjamin Samuel. c2001. *A taxonomy for learning, teaching, and assessing: a revision of Bloom's Taxonomy of educational objectives*. Edited by Lorin W. Anderson. Abridged ed. New York: Longman.

Baltic Defence College. 2025. *Comprehensive Operational Planning Course*. https://tinyurl.com/3bsa7jce

CSMSS University of Defence. 2023. *Study curriculum of the lifelong learning program, Senior Officer Course*. Centre for Security and Military Strategic Studies, University of Defence. Brno.

European External Action Service. 2021. *Sectoral qualifications framework for the military officer profession: SQFMILOF. Volume 2*. Publications Office. ISBN 978-92-9463-010-0. Brussels. https://data.europa.eu/doi/10.2871/989318

George T. Doran. 1981. "There's a S.M.A.R.T. way to write management's goals and objectives." *Management review* Vol 70 (11). ISSN: 0025-1895, 0025-1895. https://muni.cz/go/20561a

HRONÍK, František. 2007. *Rozvoj a vzdělávání pracovníků*. Vyd. 1. Praha: Grada, Vedení lidí v praxi. ISBN 978-80-247-1457-8.

Krontorád, František, and Milan Trčka. 2005. *Manažerské standardy ve veřejné správě: (úvod ke kompetenčnímu managementu) : výstup z projektu podpory jakosti č. 2/9/2005*.

Lokhoff, Jenneke, Bas Wegewijs, Katja Durkin, et al. 2010. *A Tuning Guide to Formulating Degree Programme Profiles including Programme Competences and Programme Learning Outcomes*. Bilbao, Groningen, and The Hague. https://muni.cz/go/774a06.

McCauley, Daniel H. 2014. Competence-based Approach to Joint Professional Military Education (JPME) Educating the Joint Force for 2020 and Beyond. *Canadian Military Journal*. Vol 15. no.1. pp. 53-58. ISSN 1492-465X, https://goo.gl/swn6n6

NATO School Oberammergau. *Comprehensive Operational Planning Course*. https://tinyurl.com/4n3h4st8

NATO Standardization Office. 2019. *AJP-5, Allied Joint Doctrine for the Planning of Operations*, Edition A, Version 2. Brussels.

Petráš, Zdeněk. 2023. "Conceptual Approach to Multi-Domain Operations." *Vojenské rozhledy - Czech Military Review* **32**(4), s. 66-85. ISSN 1210-3292. doi:10.3849/2336-2995.32.2023.04.066-085

Procházka, Jakub, Martin Vaculík a Petr Smutný. 2013. *Psychologie efektivního leadershipu*. Praha: Grada. ISBN: 978-80-247-8690-2.

Sadler, D. Royce. 1989. "Formative assessment and the design of instructional systems." *Instr Sci* 18, 119–144. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00117714

Spišák, Ján. 2015. „Některé problémy vzájemného vztahu strategie a operačního umění - Some Difficulties of Correlation between Strategy and Operational art." *Vojenské rozhledy*, roč. 24 (56), č. 3, s. 132–143, ISSN 1210-3292 (tištěná verze), ISSN 2336-2995 (on-line). doi: 10.3849/1210-3292,24.2015.03.132-143.

Štěpánek, P*řemysl*. 2019. "Kompetence vojenského personálu pro velení a řízení." Final thesis of the General Staff Course, Brno: Univerzity of Defence.

Thawabieh, Ahmad Mahmoud. 2017. "A Comparison between Students' Self-Assessment and Teachers' Assessment." *Journal of Curriculum and Teaching*, Vol. 6, No. 1. http://dx.doi.org/10.5430/jct.v6n1p14

The Supreme Headquarters Allied Powers Europe. 2023. *Comprehensive Operations Planning Directive*, *version 3.1*. Mons.

Veteška, Jaroslav, and Michaela Tureckiová. 2008. *Kompetence ve vzdělávání*. Pedagogika (Grada). Praha: Grada. ISBN 978-80-247-1770-8.

Military History Institute. 2025. *Czech Armed Forces Development Concept 2035*. Praha. https://tinyurl.com/bvmf22uz

Zhang, Jie, and Marcie Desrochers. 2023. "Evaluation of Teacher, Self-Assessment, and Combined Feedback to Increase Students' Behavioral Observation Skills." *International Journal of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education*, Volume 35, Number 1, 48-66. https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1411869.pdf