

## THE COMMAND AND STAFF SCHOOL

### COMMAND, LEADERSHIP, ETHICS & MANAGEMENT MODULE

#### GROUP PRESENTATION ASSESSMENT

##### 8<sup>th</sup> JCSC

1. **Introduction.** As part of the course requirements for the Command, Leadership, Ethics & Management (CLEM) module, students will complete a group oral presentation assessment on Thursday, 18SEP25.
2. The CLEM presentation provides each course member with an opportunity to do some personal research in an allocated CLEM studies area based on the material covered in class, personal experience and professional interest, to date. In the weeks preceding the presentation, course members will cover concepts of Command, Leadership, Ethics and Management and their application and execution at various levels, from tactical to strategic. Students will also be introduced to relevant case studies and approaches to personnel development in order to enhance their awareness of both their own leadership style and to prepare them for future command appointments. **Course members will be expected to apply these concepts in their presentations.**
3. Each officer student will be allocated a presentation group by lottery on 04SEP25.
4. CLEM group presentations will be conducted on Thursday, 18 SEP 25 (see Annex A). Each presentation will examine and present conclusions regarding the assigned question (Annex B).
5. **Format**
  - a. Officer students will conduct a **20/30-minute** presentation on the allocated question, within groupings at the location specified in Annex A. The presentation provides a succinct summary of the analysis and conclusions derived from the group's research for the presentation – speaking time should be divided evenly between the officer students.
  - b. At the end of the presentation, students will answer questions from the assessment board, in order to probe the groups learning and engagement with the material. Additionally, this will allow students to develop or emphasise points as well as expand on their own personal learning. This segment will contribute to the final result for the presentation. Each group will be asked one (1) collective question that all members will contribute an answer to. This will be followed by one (1) individual question to each group member. Questions will be clear and concise and pertinent to the presentation. Similarly, students will be expected to answer in a concise and accurate manner.
  - c. The group may decide the method/style of delivery of the presentation. PowerPoint (or similar format) is NOT obligatory. Where PowerPoint (or similar) is used, the officer students will present the Directing Staff (DS) with 3 x copies (9x copies for standardisation) of a printout of any slide show used. This is to assist the DS to take contemporaneous notes and is NOT marked. There is no requirement to cover or bind this hand out. The pages should have 3 slides to a page (i.e. printed in .ppt

*handout* format). If a group chooses not to use PowerPoint then they should provide the DS with a handout covering their main themes, arguments and references.

- d. Following the presentation, students will provide the Directing Staff with a digital copy of their PowerPoint or handout with the reference material clearly legible.
- e. Students who are not directly presenting will attend ongoing presentations. They are free to choose those of interest to their own studies.
- f. Students are reminded of academic conventions and the need for thorough and complete referencing. Course members are minded to review MU's Policy on Academic Integrity and C&S School unit Standing Orders Chapter 5, Section 6. Where an assessor has reasonable grounds to believe that a case of academic misconduct has been identified (which includes the use of generative artificial intelligence (AI) to complete all or part of this assessment without acknowledgement), the assessor may refer the matter to the Head of the Department.

## 6. Grading

- a. **180 marks are allocated to this presentation.** Students are to note the guideline marking rubric for the CLEM presentations (copy of rubric attached). Assessment boards will be comprised of Maynooth University academics and military DS.
- b.

CLEM GROUP PRESENTATION		
CRITERIA	MARKS	%
<b>Content</b>		
Use of sources, depth of research, knowledge, accuracy, framework & theory	72	40
<b>Analysis</b>		
Evaluation, logic & reasoning, argument, synthesis (cohesion & linkages)	72	40
<b>Style</b>		
Expression, tone, flow	18	10
<b>Individual Content &amp; Analysis</b>		
Depth of research, knowledge, accuracy, Evaluation, logic & reasoning, argument	18	10
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>180</b>	<b>100</b>

- (1) Read the marking rubric attached for details of indicative descriptors.
- (2) Students should concentrate on their findings, analysis and conclusions deduced from their research.
- (3) For 2 member groups, for every full minute over or under 20mins, 1 mark will be deducted from the overall score (maximum deduction 5 marks). Therefore, there is no deduction for presentations that finish between 19:00 and 21:00.

- (4) For 3 member groups, for every full minute over or under 30mins, one (1) mark will be deducted from the overall score (maximum deduction 5 marks). Therefore, there is no deduction for presentations that finish between 29:00 and 31:00.
- (5) **Student presentations will be stopped after 25 minutes for 2 member groups/ 35 minutes for 3 member groups.**
- (6) The presentation and the questions from the assessment board are marked.
- (7) All groups will attend all presentations within their syndicate except for the presentation immediately preceding their own presentation.

7. **Feedback:** Written Feedback will be provided to each student.

8. **POC.** Comdt James O'Hara.

**8<sup>th</sup> JOINT COMMAND AND STAFF COURSE**  
**CLEM PRESENTATIONS**  
**18 SEP 2025**

<b>18 SEP 2025</b>					
<b>Exam No.</b>	<b>Rank</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Group and Question Number</b>	<b>Time</b>	<b>Location</b>
<b>1</b>	Comdt	Moroney	<b>1</b>	<b>0930 – 0950 Standardisation</b>	DH
<b>2</b>	Comdt	Bolger			
<b>3</b>	Comdt	Woulfe	<b>2</b>	<b>1020 – 1040 Standardisation</b>	DH
<b>4</b>	Major	Pousson			
<b>5</b>	Comdt	Quinn	<b>3</b>	<b>1120-1140</b>	DH
<b>6</b>	Lt Cdr	Carr			
<b>7</b>	Comdt	McIntyre	<b>4</b>	<b>1120-1140</b>	SR 2
<b>8</b>	Comdt	Culbert			
<b>9</b>	Comdt	Beatty	<b>5</b>	<b>1200-1220</b>	DH
<b>10</b>	Comdt	McNamara			
<b>11</b>	Comdt	Harmon	<b>6</b>	<b>1200-1220</b>	SR 2
<b>12</b>	Comdt	McDonnell			
<b>13</b>	Comdt	Doyle	<b>7</b>	<b>1330-1350</b>	DH
<b>14</b>	Lt Cdr	Stack			
<b>15</b>	Lt Cdr	Donaldson	<b>8</b>	<b>1330-1350</b>	SR 2
<b>16</b>	Comdt	McGrath			
<b>17</b>	Comdt	Fagan	<b>9</b>	<b>1410-1430</b>	DH
<b>18</b>	Lt Cdr	Flynn			
<b>19</b>	Comdt	Rath	<b>10</b>	<b>1410-1430</b>	SR 2
<b>20</b>	Lt Cdr	Quigley			
<b>21</b>	Comdt	Hickey	<b>11</b>	<b>1450-1520</b>	DH
<b>22</b>	Comdt	Waters			
<b>23</b>	Comdt	O'Reilly			

**CLEM GROUP PRESENTATION QUESTIONS**  
**8<sup>th</sup> JOINT COMMAND AND STAFF COURSE**

1. **Mission Command and Small-State Militaries** To what extent does the Irish Defence Forces' adoption of mission command reflect the principles of 'adaptive leadership' in modern warfare?
2. **National Resilience & Defence** The Defence Forces should actively engage with various stakeholders, including government officials, community leaders, and the public in fostering the debate on national defence and security. How can the Defence Forces from an ethical, leadership and managerial perspective be a persuader in a democratic environment to influence the body politic and general public on the need to adapt Level of Ambition Three.
3. **Ethics of Autonomous Systems** Should the Irish Defence Forces begin integrating AI and autonomous platforms into operations, and what ethical safeguards should be in place if so?
4. **Gender and Inclusion in Military Command** What are the leadership implications of increasing diversity within the Defence Forces, and how can inclusive command practices be operationalized?
5. **Strategic Communication and Public Trust** How should Irish Defence Forces leaders manage public trust and strategic communications within ethical boundaries in the era of social media and disinformation?
6. **Ethical Leadership and Chain of Command** Discuss how and where moral courage might require diverging from orders. How should military leaders weigh this tension within the Irish command context?
7. **Ethical Decision-Making in Multinational Operations** How should senior officers address ethical dilemmas arising from conflicting national interests in NATO or EU-led missions?
8. **Toxic Leadership** Is it possible to change the behaviour of leaders in the Irish Defence Forces who display toxic leadership traits? If so, how?
9. **Command in Hybrid Warfare** How can senior officers in the Irish Defence Forces and Western militaries effectively lead in environments dominated by hybrid threats, where the potential adversary/opponent has no ethical or moral qualms?
10. **Retention and Morale in Western Militaries** How can senior officers display leadership in addressing the challenges of retention and morale in the Irish Defence Forces and 'leveraging' the example of other Western militaries?

**11. Leading Change** Identify a transformational change you would like to make in the Irish Defence Forces and address why people would resist your change identifying the Capability, Opportunity and Motivational Barriers?

PERCENTAGE BAND	CONTENT (use of sources, breadth/depth of research and knowledge, accuracy)	ANALYSIS (evaluation, logic and reasoning, argument)	STYLE (expression, tone, flow)
80% +	Extremely comprehensive solution. Exceptional research conducted. Highly innovative and imaginative. Questions orthodoxy effectively.	Flawless logic. Exceptionally insightful. Extremely convincing, compelling and authoritative argument. Highly effective critical analysis of underlying concepts and theories. Demonstrates high levels of originality and independent thought. Possibly of publishable quality.	<u>Written:</u> Tone completely appropriate. Precise and unequivocal expression. Excellent structure. Flows eloquently. Highest standards of presentation <sup>1</sup> achieved. <u>Oral:</u> <sup>2</sup> Very little (if any) dependence on notes / notes used very effectively without undermining engagement with the audience. Exceptional IPD. <sup>3</sup> Excellent level of engagement maintained with the audience throughout. Highly effective use of briefing aids.
70% to 79%	Highly comprehensive solution with high levels of accuracy. Extremely effective research that engages with debates within the relevant literature. Range of sources used selectively and imaginatively to support argument. Good attempt to challenge orthodoxy.	Highly logical. Excellent understanding of underlying concepts. Extremely well-constructed argument displaying critical analysis, originality and independent thought. Most persuasive.	<u>Written:</u> Tone appropriate. Highly competent expression. Very well structured. Flows fluently. Very good standards of presentation throughout. <u>Oral:</u> Little dependence on notes / notes used effectively without undermining engagement with the audience. Very good IPD and engagement with the audience. Very good use of briefing aids.
60% to 69%	Considered most of the essential issues. Relevant literature/key texts used effectively to engage with current debates. Good degree of accuracy demonstrated. Reasonable attempt to challenge orthodoxy.	Sound logic and understanding of underlying theories and concepts. Convincing and concise argument. Critical evaluation of perspectives with some evidence of originality.	<u>Written:</u> Tone generally suitable. Coherent expression. Well structured. Flows well. Standards of presentation generally adhered to. <u>Oral:</u> Not overly dependent on notes. Good IPD demonstrated. Audience well engaged throughout. Good use of briefing aids.
50 to 59%	Some omission of key/relevant issues, with some minor inaccuracies. Satisfactory research demonstrating reasonable familiarity with relevant literature.	Satisfactory logic. Reasonably coherent and convincing solution. Demonstrate some capacity to reflect critically on underlying theories and concepts, but little evidence of originality.	<u>Written:</u> Adequate tone and expression but may need some amending. Standards of presentation generally adhered to with some amendments necessary. Structure and flow could be improved. <u>Oral:</u> Some reliance on notes but did maintain a satisfactory level of audience awareness. Elements of IPD could be improved. Briefing aids could be used more effectively.
45-49%	Question addressed but several relevant issues not covered. Evidence of a basic familiarity with relevant literature. Contains inaccuracies.	Logic open to some doubt. Underdeveloped and unconvincing argument. Limited evidence of critical analysis. Has a basic grasp of underlying concepts, but a lack of understanding is demonstrated in places.	<u>Written:</u> Tone in need of some amendment. Expression often less than satisfactory. Standards of presentation not adequately addressed. Structure in need of significant revision. <u>Oral:</u> Very dependent on notes. IPD requires significant improvement. Briefing aids unsuitable.
40% to 44%	Limited consideration of relevant issues. Limited research. Incomplete knowledge of subject evident. Contains significant inaccuracies.	Logic poor. Limited understanding of underlying concepts. Not very convincing. Critical analysis limited.	<u>Written:</u> Tone and/or expression in need of significant amendment. A significant number of errors in presentation. Structure requires major reworking. <u>Oral:</u> Almost complete dependence on notes. IPD very poor. Inappropriate use of briefing aids.
Under 40%	Little relevant information. Poorly researched. Contains fundamental errors.	Logically unsound. Completely unconvincing argument. Question not addressed. Little or no understanding of key issues and underlying concepts. Little or no evidence of ability to critically analyse.	<u>Written:</u> Tone completely unsuitable/inappropriate. Expression weak and ineffective. Muddled arrangement. Careless writing style with errors in presentation consistent throughout. Flow disjointed and difficult to follow. Structured very poorly. <u>Oral:</u> Complete dependence on notes; the brief is read. IPD completely unsatisfactory. Briefing aids entirely unsuitable/inappropriate.

<sup>1</sup> Standards of presentation refer to spelling, grammar, punctuation, syntax and referencing.

<sup>2</sup> Additional aspects to be considered for oral assessment under the criterion of style.

<sup>3</sup> Interpersonal Dynamics (IPD): eye contact, mannerisms, body language, confidence, etc.

