

AD-A154 815

SOCIAL ACTIONS UTILIZATION FIELDS (AFS 736XA/B 737X)
(U) AIR FORCE OCCUPATIONAL MEASUREMENT CENTER RANDOLPH
AFB TX MAR 85


1/1

UNCLASSIFIED


F/G 5/9

NL

END
DATE
FILMED
7 1985



MICROCOPY RESOLUTION TEST CHART
NATIONAL BUREAU OF STANDARDS 1963-A



UNITED STATES AIR FORCE

AD-A154 815

TRAINING REPORT

DTIC
ELECTE
JUN 10 1985
S B D

DTIC FILE COPY

SOCIAL ACTIONS UTILIZATION FIELD

(AFS 736XA/B, 737X)

AFPT 90-73X-519

MARCH 1985

OCCUPATIONAL ANALYSIS PROGRAM
USAF OCCUPATIONAL MEASUREMENT CENTER
AIR TRAINING COMMAND
RANDOLPH AFB, TEXAS 78150

APPROVED FOR PUBLIC RELEASE; DISTRIBUTION UNLIMITED

85 5 18 075

DISTRIBUTION FOR
AFSC 73XX TRAINING REPORT AND SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS

	<u>OSR</u>	<u>TNG</u> <u>EXT</u>
AFHRL/MODS	2	1m
AFHRL/ID	1	1m/1h
AFMEA/MEMD	1	1
AFMPC/MPCMC	2	
AFMPC/MPCX	1	1
ARMY OCCUPATIONAL SURVEY BRANCH	1	
CCAF/AYX	1	
DEFENSE TECHNICAL INFORMATION CENTER	1	
DOD EOMI PATRICK AFB FL 32925	3	3
HQ AAC/DPAT	3	3
HQ AFCC/LGMMT	1	1
HQ AFCC/MPPTT	3	3
HQ AFISC/DAP	1	
HQ AFLC/MPCA	3	3
HQ AFSC/MPAT	3	3
HQ ATC/DPAE	1	1
HQ ATC/TTQC	2	1
HQ ESC/TTGT	1	1
HQ ESC/DPTE	2	2
HQ MAC/DPAT	3	3
HQ MAC/TTGT	1	1
HQ PACAF/TTGT	1	1
HQ PACAF/DPAT	3	3
HQ SAC/DPAT	3	3
HQ SAC/TTGT	1	1
HQ TAC/DPAT	3	3
HQ TAC/TTGT	1	1
HQ USAF/MPXH	1	1
HQ USAF/MPPT	1	1
HQ USAFE/DPAT	3	3
HQ USAFE/TTGT	1	1
HQ USMC (CODE TPI)	1	
LMDC/AN	1	
NODAC	1	
3250 TCHTW/TTGX (LACKLAND AFB TX)	5	5
3507 ACS/DPKI	1	

m = microfiche only

h = hard copy only

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>PAGE NUMBER</u>
PREFACE -----	iii
INTRODUCTION -----	1
SURVEY METHODOLOGY -----	2
Inventory Development -----	2
Training Emphasis Administration -----	2
TRAINING ANALYSIS -----	4
POI Analysis -----	4
SUMMARY AND IMPLICATIONS -----	12

Accession For	
NTIS CFA&I	☒
DTIC TAB	☐
Unannounced	☐
Justification	
By	
Distribution/	
Availability Codes	
Avail and/or	
Dist	
A-1	



PREFACE

This report presents the results of a detailed Air Force occupational survey involving the training requirements for Social Actions Officers (AFSSs 736XA/B and 737X). The USAF Occupational Measurement Center completed this project by authority of AFR 35-2.

The survey instrument, USAF Job Inventory AFPT 90-73X-519, dated October 1983, was developed by Chief Master Sergeant Theodore R. Wilcox. Second Lieutenant Mary Thomasson analyzed the survey data and wrote the final report. Ms Olga Velez provided computer support for the project. This training report has been reviewed and approved by Mr J. S. Tartell, Chief, Management Applications Section, USAF Occupational Measurement Center.

Copies of this report have been distributed to Air Staff sections, major commands, and other interested training and management personnel. Additional copies are available upon request to the USAF Occupational Measurement Center, Attention: Chief Occupational Analysis Branch (OMY), Randolph AFB, Texas 76150-5000.

PAUL T. RINGENBACH, Colonel, USAF
Commander
USAF Occupational Measurement
Center

WALTER E. DRISKILL, Ph. D.
Chief, Occupational Analysis Branch
USAF Occupational Measurement
Center

TRAINING REPORT
SOCIAL ACTIONS UTILIZATION FIELD
(AFS 736XA/B, 737X)

INTRODUCTION

This is a report of a training analysis of the Social Actions officer utilization field (AFSS 736XA/B and 737X) completed by the Occupational Analysis Branch, USAF Occupational Measurement Center, in January 1985. The survey was requested by the 3290 TCHTG/TTZSC, Lackland AFB, Texas. The primary objective of the study was to provide information for planning and developing training documents, as well as assessing the validity of the training course content. Analyses of the job structure, DAFSC groups, AFR 36-1 and 39-1 specialty descriptions, job satisfaction, CONUS and overseas groups, MAJCOM groups, and time in career field (TICF) groups were covered in an Occupational Survey Report (OSR) published in November 1984.

This training report provides task data training managers can use in conjunction with career ladder documents to assess the effectiveness of Social Actions officer training. Topics discussed in this report include assessments of: (1) Equal Opportunity Management Institute (EOMI) Curriculum Guide/POI (dated 1984); (2) POI L3OZR7364B, Drug/Alcohol Abuse Control (dated 3 January 1984); and (3) POI L3OZR7371, Social Actions Staff Officer (dated 28 November 1983).

The job of a Social Actions officer involves advising and assisting commanders and supervisors in administering Social Actions programs. They also plan, organize, and manage Social Actions activities, including equal opportunity, drug and alcohol abuse control, and education in human relations programs.

Airmen and officers in the Equal Opportunity/Human Relations specialty (A-shred personnel) attend a 16-week resident training course at the Defense Equal Opportunity Management Institute, Patrick AFB, Florida. Drug/Alcohol Abuse personnel (B-shred) attend technical training for 8 weeks and 2 days at Lackland AFB, Texas. Staff officers attend technical training for 2 weeks at Lackland AFB, Texas.

APPROVED FOR PUBLIC RELEASE; DISTRIBUTION UNLIMITED

SURVEY METHODOLOGY

Inventory Development

The data collection instrument for this occupational survey was USAF Job Inventory AFPT 90-73X-519, dated October 1983. Development of the inventory task list began with a review of past surveys of AFS 734X0A/B and 736XB career areas, as well as a review of current specialty publications and directives. Also, interviews were conducted with 98 officer, enlisted, and civilian Social Actions personnel at 12 CONUS and overseas locations. From the interviews, a tentative task list was developed. The tentative inventory was validated by a field review at 13 MAJCOM-level Social Actions units. The field review resulted in a refined task list of 511 tasks representative of the work performed by Social Actions personnel.

Training Emphasis Administration

During the period December 1983 through November 1984, training emphasis (TE) booklets were administered to selected Social Actions officers (AFS 736XA/B and 737X) at operational units, both in the CONUS and at overseas locations, by consolidated base personnel offices. Personnel were identified from uniform officer record (UOR) data tapes generated by the Air Force Manpower and Personnel Center (AFMPC) and maintained by the Air Force Human Resources Laboratory (AFHRL).

Each individual completing a TE booklet rated tasks on a 10-point scale from no training emphasis required to extremely heavy training required.

<u>RATING SCALE</u>	<u>FIRST-TERM TRAINING EMPHASIS RECOMMENDED</u>
BLANK	No structured training required
1	Extremely low training emphasis
2	Very low training emphasis
3	Low average training emphasis
4	Below average training emphasis
5	Average training emphasis
6	Above average training emphasis
7	High training emphasis
8	Very high training emphasis
9	Extremely high training emphasis

Training emphasis is a rating of which tasks require structured training for first-term personnel. Structured training is defined as training provided at resident technical schools, field training detachments (FTD), mobile training teams (MTT), formal OJT, or any other organized training method.

Inventory data returned from the field were entered into the AFHRL computer at Brooks AFB either by optical scanning or keypunching. The Comprehensive Occupational Data Analysis Program (CODAP) software package was then used to analyze the data. The CODAP package produces a variety of computer printouts based on survey respondent ratings on inventory tasks.

The number of raters and interrater reliability for Social Actions officers is shown in Table 1. As seen in the table, a total of 20 7364A officers provided TE ratings for A-shred officers. Agreement among 7364A raters was .90, which indicates high agreement. Twenty-six 7364B officers provided B-shred TE ratings. The interrater agreement among B-shred officers was .91, which also indicates high agreement. Staff officer raters totaled 15. Their interrater agreement was also .91.

TABLE 1
TRAINING EMPHASIS INTERRATER RELIABILITIES
FOR SOCIAL ACTIONS OFFICERS

<u>DAFSC</u>	<u>NUMBER OF TE RATERS</u>	<u>INTERRATER RELIABILITY</u>
7364A	20	.90
7364B	26	.91
7376	15	.91

TRAINING ANALYSIS

An important use of occupational survey data is in the validation of training documents. Survey data useful for this application include TE ratings and percentages of TICF groups performing tasks. The data are useful in evaluating the Plans of Instruction (POI) for the basic resident technical training course. The data-gathering process for collecting TE data was explained in the SURVEY METHODOLOGY section.

The TE ratings collected from the 7364A personnel yielded an average rating of 2.49 and a standard deviation of 1.98. For the purposes of this training analysis, tasks rated higher than 4.47 were considered high in training emphasis for 7364A personnel. The TE ratings collected from the 7364B personnel yielded an average rating of 2.47 and a standard deviation of 1.81. Tasks rated higher than 4.28 were considered high in training emphasis. Training emphasis ratings collected from 7376 personnel yielded an average rating of 3.42 and a standard deviation of 2.13. High training emphasis for 7376 personnel is considered 5.55. With respect to percent members performing data, 1-24 months TICF (first job) and 1-48 months TICF groups are normally examined in the course of a training analysis. In accordance with ATC regulation 52-22, tasks performed by at least 50 percent or more personnel should be considered for inclusion in a basic residence course. Tasks performed by at least 30 percent, but less than 50 percent, may be considered for inclusion in formal training, although not necessarily in a basic residence course.

A review of the Equal Opportunity Management Institute (EOMI) Curriculum Guide/POI, dated 1984; POI L3OZR7364B, Drug and Alcohol Abuse Control, dated 3 January 1984; and POI L3OZR7371, Social Actions Staff Officer, dated 28 November 1983, was possible through the assistance of training personnel at the Lackland Technical Training Center and EOMI. Subject-matter specialists from the schools matched relevant job inventory tasks to specific POI items. An analysis of the POI consists of examining the tasks matched to each item (paragraph, unit, or block), along with their respective TE and percent members performing data, to determine whether the survey data support inclusion of the item in the training document. Since the POI blocks are written as knowledge objectives and the job inventory was written as a series of performance tasks, a direct evaluation of the course effectiveness is difficult. The following paragraphs highlight items found as a result of the analysis of these documents.

POI Analysis

Based on the previously mentioned assistance from technical school subject-matter specialists in matching inventory tasks to the POI, computer products were generated displaying the results of that matching process. Information displayed for consideration included TE ratings, as well as percent members performing data for 1-24 months TICF (first job), 1-48 months TICF, and DAFSC groups.

EOMI 1984 Curriculum Guide/POI: The POI used to outline training for 7364A personnel contained 168 blocks. Of those, 97 had no tasks matched and, for the most part, were knowledge items. Of the blocks with tasks matched, 62 were well supported by the survey data.

Block H-025 involves instruction on budgeting. Of the 11 tasks matched to this block, only 2 received high TE ratings. Less than 50 percent of the personnel in the 1-24 months TICF group performed these tasks. Only one task was performed by 50 percent of the 1-48 months TICF and DAFSC groups. These tasks should be reviewed by subject-matter specialists and training personnel to determine if inclusion in a basic residence course is warranted.

Block H-050-3 titled, "Know the seven steps to process an equal employment opportunity (EEO) complaint," had only one task matched to it. This task received a very low TE rating and had very low percentage of members performing. Training personnel should review this block to determine if inclusion in the POI is warranted.

Block J-060 titled, "Student presentations (Historical Perspective)," had no tasks matched to it, however, requires a performance measurement. This could mean an applicable task has not been matched or there are no clearly defined inventory tasks appropriate to that block. In any case, subject-matter specialists and training personnel should review this block in detail to assure inclusion is justified.

Of the tasks not referenced to any block, 13 received high TE ratings and had substantial percents of A-shred officers performing. These tasks are illustrated in Table 2. Eight of the 13 unmatched tasks with high TE ratings involved climate assessment functions. Including a block of instruction on climate assessment functions in the EOMI Curriculum Guide/POI may be justified.

POI L3OZR7364B: The plan of instruction used to outline training for Drug and Alcohol Abuse Control Officers contained 92 blocks (paragraphs or subparagraphs). Of those, 35 were knowledge items and had no tasks matched. Most of the blocks with tasks matched appeared well supported by the survey data; however, eight of those need to be reviewed by subject-matter specialists and training personnel to determine if the amount of time allotted for instruction is appropriate. Those eight blocks are as follows:

Block II, Section 1C, of the POI represents 1 hour of instruction on presenting a 15 minute lecture. The five tasks matched to this section received high TE ratings and have high percentages of members performing. Only one of these five tasks had less than 50 percent of first-job or 1-48 months TICF personnel performing. Also, to successfully complete this block, a performance measurement is required. Since the tasks matched to this block received high TE ratings and substantial percentages of members performing, more time may need to be devoted to this block.

Block III, Section 8, of the POI represents 4 hours of instruction on the behavior confrontation model and what action a supervisor should take in relation to suspected alcohol abuse. Only one task (document subordinate counseling sessions) was matched to Section 8. Training to the extent indicated appears questionable. Perhaps the match of this one task is an accurate reflection of the block of instruction; perhaps other tasks should have been matched. In either case, this section of Block III should be reviewed.

Block III, Sections 9A and 9B on crisis intervention techniques, have only one task matched to each of them, but represent 3 hours of instruction each. The matched tasks received high TE ratings, but only moderate percentages of members performing. These sections should be reviewed to determine if 3 hours of instruction each are justified.

Block IV, Section 2C, represents 15 minutes of instruction on the responsibilities of a Social Actions Section. The three tasks matched to this subparagraph received very high TE ratings and percentages of members performing. Considering the high ratings of these tasks, more time probably needs to be devoted to this section.

Block IV, Section 2D, represents 15 minutes of instruction on Air Force policy on matters for which Social Actions is responsible. The one task matched to this section received a high TE rating and had 100 percent members performing. As with Section 2C, more time probably needs to be devoted to this section.

Block IV, Section 4A. As with the two previous sections, Section 4A of Block IV should be reviewed to determine if more time is justified. This block represents 30 minutes of instruction on developing a referral listing; however, all but one of the five matched tasks received high TE ratings. All five had high percent members performing. Perhaps more time needs to be devoted to instructing the development of referral listings.

From the list of tasks not referenced to any block of the POI, 7364B TE raters gave high ratings to 38 tasks. Of those, 17 were tasks from Duty L, Drug or Alcohol Abuse Control Documentation Functions. The 17 tasks mainly involved reviewing "27 series" forms. The percentage of members performing these tasks was high in the three groups examined (first job, 1-48 months T1CF, and 7364B total sample). Table 3 illustrates these 17 tasks, their TE ratings, and percentages of members performing. These tasks, as well as the others not referenced to the POI, should be reviewed and considered for inclusion in the appropriate channel of instruction of the basic course.

POI L3OZR7371: The plan of instruction used to outline training for Social Actions Staff Officers contained 21 blocks (paragraphs or subparagraphs). Of those, only the Registration and Overview block had no tasks matched. Of the tasks matched to the POI, only four received high TE ratings. These four tasks were:

Brief commanders, first sergeants, or other agency
personnel on human relations or other EOT programs
or policies
Conduct formal briefings
Evaluate drug and alcohol abuse rehabilitation programs
Conduct unit self-inspections

The matched tasks, for the most part, received average or below average TE ratings, but had high percent members performing. Tasks typical of those matched to the POI are illustrated in Table 4. Note these tasks are those one would expect a staff officer to perform.

Analysis revealed 94 tasks not matched to the POI received high TE ratings. Interestingly, many of these tasks had very low percent members performing. Typical unmatched tasks are illustrated in Table 5. Note these tasks are those that normally would be performed by junior Social Actions officers or enlisted Social Actions personnel (see DAFSC section of the Occupational Survey Report, dated November 1984).

It appears the staff officers surveyed feel the tasks they actually perform do not require extensive training. Conversely, they indicate training is necessary for tasks they may not perform to a large extent. Apparently, they feel it is important to know how to perform "technical" Social Actions tasks to be an effective staff officer. Whatever the reason, the POI for the Social Actions Staff Officer course should be carefully reviewed and possibly revised to include tasks which are essential knowledge for a Social Actions Staff Officer.

TABLE 2

TASKS RATED HIGH IN TRAINING EMPHASIS BY 7364A RATERS AND
NOT MATCHED TO THE EOMI CURRICULUM GUIDE/POI

TASKS	TNG EMPH	PERCENT MEMBERS PERFORMING		
		1ST JOB (N=31)	1-48 MOS TICF (N=49)	AFS 7364A (N=62)
J423 EVALUATE IMPACT OF EOT COMPLAINTS, RACIAL INCIDENTS, OR OTHER INCIDENTS	7.00	77	86	87
J406 ADVISE UNIT COMMANDERS OF RESULTS OF CLIMATE ASSESSMENT EVALUATIONS	6.35	71	67	71
J407 BRIEF COMMANDERS ON ALLEGED DISCRIMINATION OCCURRING IN OFF-BASE BUSINESS ESTABLISHMENTS	5.65	61	65	69
G355 REVIEW HIGHER HEADQUARTERS SUMMARIES OF AAP REPORTS	5.35	68	67	71
B146 DRAFT OR WRITE AIRMAN PERFORMANCE REPORTS (APR)	5.25	87	88	90
J403 ADVISE MANAGEMENT PERSONNEL OF BASE FACILITIES OR AGENCIES ON RESULTS OF CLIMATE ASSESSMENT EVALUATIONS	5.10	61	65	69
J421 EVALUATE EXTENT OF HATE GROUP ACTIVITIES IN LOCAL AREA	5.05	65	65	66
G354 REVIEW HIGHER HEADQUARTERS EVALUATIONS OF AAP STATUS	5.00	65	65	69
I386 ADVISE BASE SPECIAL OBSERVANCE COMMITTEES ON CELEBRATIONS, EVENTS, OR DISPLAYS	4.75	65	69	71
J428 EVALUATE RECREATIONAL PROGRAMS FOR EVIDENCE OF POLARIZATION	4.70	61	67	68
A33 CONDUCT SOCIAL ACTIONS RELATED MEETINGS, CONFERENCES, OR WORKING GROUPS	4.65	84	80	82
J409 COORDINATE WITH BASE AGENCY PERSONNEL, SUCH AS SECURITY POLICE OR HOUSING REFERRAL, ON CLIMATE ASSESSMENT FACTORS	4.65	58	63	68
J431 EVALUATE VARIETY OF ON-BASE ENTERTAINMENT AVAILABLE	4.55	58	61	65

TABLE 3

DUTY L TASKS RATED HIGH IN TRAINING EMPHASIS BY 7364B RATERS
AND NOT MATCHED TO POI L30ZR7364B

TASKS	TNG EMPH	PERCENT MEMBERS PERFORMING		
		1ST JOB (N=27)	1-48 MOS TICF (N=44)	AFS 7364B (N=66)
L494 PERFORM QUALITY CONTROL REVIEWS ON DRUG OR ALCOHOL CASE FILES	7.38	96	96	91
L495 RECONCILE APDS DESIRE LISTINGS WITH CASE FILE DOCUMENTATION	6.54	48	59	53
L504 REVIEW AF FORMS 2740	5.77	89	89	85
L510 REVIEW APDS DESIRE LISTINGS	5.77	70	77	74
L508 REVIEW AF FORMS 2745	5.73	96	96	89
L498 REVIEW AF FORMS 2731	5.69	96	96	91
L499 REVIEW AF FORMS 2734	5.69	96	93	88
L506 REVIEW AF FORMS 2743 (SUBSTANCE ABUSE CONTROL PROGRAM - COMMANDER/SUPERVISOR EVALUATION)	5.65	96	96	89
L507 REVIEW AF FORMS 2744 (SUBSTANCE ABUSE CONTROL PROGRAM - SELF-EVALUATION BY REHABILITEE)	5.65	96	96	89
L509 REVIEW AF FORMS 2746	5.65	96	96	88
L505 REVIEW AF FORMS 2741	5.58	93	89	84
L497 REVIEW AF FORMS 2730	5.50	93	93	88
L496 RETRIEVE DATA FROM APDS	5.19	26	36	32
L500 REVIEW AF FORMS 2735 (SUBSTANCE ABUSE CONTROL PROGRAM - AUTHORITY TO RELEASE INFORMATION)	5.08	82	82	79
L511 REVIEW APDS TRANSACTION REGISTERS	4.81	48	64	56
L502 REVIEW AF FORMS 2737	4.54	85	84	82
L492 INPUT DATA INTO ADVANCED PERSONNEL DATA SYSTEM (APDS) USING CATHODE RAY TUBES (CRT)	4.46	41	46	39

TABLE 4

EXAMPLE BLOCK OF POI L30ZR7371 WITH MATCHED TASKS

PERCENT MEMBERS PERFORMING				
	TNG EMPH	1ST JOB (N=13)	1-48 MOS TICF (N=25)	AFS 7376 (N=68)

008 13A. GIVEN A SOCIAL ACTIONS MANAGEMENT SITUATION, DETERMINE THE OPTION THAT BEST DESCRIBES WHICH MANAGEMENT FUNCTION TO USE IN ADDRESSING THE SITUATION, WITH A MINIMUM ACCURACY OF 3 OUT OF 4 TEST ITEMS.				

MEAS: W				

B146 DRAFT OR WRITE AIRMAN PERFORMANCE REPORTS (APR)	5.20	69	60	60
B141 COUNSEL PERSONNEL ON JOB PERFORMANCE OR MILITARY-RELATED PROBLEMS	3.80	85	88	84
B148 DRAFT OR WRITE CIVILIAN PERFORMANCE REPORTS, SUCH AS JOB PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL SYSTEM (JPAS) RATINGS	3.47	62	72	68
B152 DRAFT OR WRITE NOMINATIONS FOR AWARDS OR DECORATIONS	3.47	85	88	81
B149 DRAFT OR WRITE LETTERS OF APPRECIATION OR REPRIMAND	3.33	92	92	82
B142 DETERMINE WORK PRIORITIES FOR SUBORDINATES	3.20	85	88	82
B145 DOCUMENT SUBORDINATE COUNSELING SESSIONS	2.87	54	68	72
B143 DEVELOP DUTY SCHEDULES	2.27	46	56	54
B151 DRAFT OR WRITE MILITARY JOB DESCRIPTIONS	2.20	23	44	47
A18 APPROVE OR DISAPPROVE STAFF STUDIES OR STAFF SUMMARIES	1.27	69	72	77

TABLE 5

EXAMPLES OF TASKS RATED HIGH IN TRAINING EMPHASIS BY
7376 RATERS AND NOT MATCHED TO POI L30ZR7376

TASKS	TNG EMPH	PERCENT MEMBERS PERFORMING		
		1ST JOB (N=13)	1-48 MOS TICF (N=25)	AFS 7376 (N=68)
G346 BRIEF COMMANDERS ON STATUS OF AAP	7.27	31	36	47
H374 INTERVIEW COMPLAINANTS	7.07	0	12	21
K452 COUNSEL REHABILITEES IN ALCOHOL PROGRAMS IN INDIVIDUAL SESSIONS	7.07	23	20	16
K453 COUNSEL REHABILITEES IN ALCOHOL PROGRAMS IN GROUP SESSIONS	7.07	15	16	12
K459 ESTABLISH DRUG OR ALCOHOL ABUSE REHABILITATION PROGRAMS	7.07	15	28	21
D218 CONDUCT COMMANDER, SUPERVISOR, OR FIRST SERGEANT DRUG AND ALCOHOL ABUSE SEMINARS	7.00	15	28	29
H370 DOCUMENT RESULTS OF INTERVIEWS INVOLVING EOT COMPLAINTS OR RACIAL INCIDENTS	7.00	0	4	16
L486 COMPLETE OR ANNOTATE AF FORMS 2746 (SUBSTANCE ABUSE CONTROL PROGRAM - CHRONOLOGICAL NOTES)	7.00	8	16	13
L490 ESTABLISH INDIVIDUAL DRUG OR ALCOHOL CASE FILES	7.00	8	8	9
H366 BRIEF COMPLAINANTS ON RESULTS OF CLARIFICATIONS	6.93	23	20	16

SUMMARY AND IMPLICATIONS

Analysis of the Social Actions officer training documents indicates these documents should be reviewed and possibly modified.

The EOMI 1984 Curriculum Guide/POI, for the most part, is well supported by the survey data. Three blocks possibly should be deleted. Tasks not referenced to the EOMI Curriculum Guide indicate a block of instruction on "climate assessment" may be justified.

Eight blocks of POI L3OZR7364B should be reviewed and have possible time adjustments made to more closely align them with data indications. A block of instruction on Drug and Alcohol Abuse Control Documentation functions should be added to this POI.

The POI used to outline the staff officers course needs to be closely reviewed. Data indicate tasks performed by Social Actions Staff Officers did not receive high TE ratings and, conversely, those tasks receiving high TE ratings are not performed to a great extent by the staff officers.

LMED
-8