



STUDY
PROJECT

The views expressed in this paper are those of the author and do not necessarily reflect the views of the Department of Defense or any of its agencies. This document may not be released for open publication until it has been cleared by the appropriate military service or government agency.

THE TRAINING AND UTILIZATION OF
ARMY NATIONAL GUARD
SENIOR SERVICE COLLEGE FELLOWS, 1987-1992

BY



Lieutenant Colonel Clinton L. Tennill, Jr., AR
Senior Service College Fellow
Tufts University

DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A: Approved for public release; distribution is unlimited.

May 1992

U.S. ARMY WAR COLLEGE, CARLISLE BARRACKS, PA 17013-5050



92-17886



REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE

Form Approved
OMB No. 0704-0188

1a. REPORT SECURITY CLASSIFICATION Unclassified		1b. RESTRICTIVE MARKINGS	
2a. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION AUTHORITY		3. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY OF REPORT Approved for public release; distribution is unlimited.	
2b. DECLASSIFICATION/DOWNGRADING SCHEDULE		5. MONITORING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER(S)	
4. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER(S)		7a. NAME OF MONITORING ORGANIZATION	
6a. NAME OF PERFORMING ORGANIZATION U.S. Army War College	6b. OFFICE SYMBOL (If applicable) AWCA	7b. ADDRESS (City, State, and ZIP Code)	
6c. ADDRESS (City, State, and ZIP Code) Carlisle Barracks, PA 17013-5050		9. PROCUREMENT INSTRUMENT IDENTIFICATION NUMBER	
8a. NAME OF FUNDING/SPONSORING ORGANIZATION	8b. OFFICE SYMBOL (If applicable)	10. SOURCE OF FUNDING NUMBERS	
8c. ADDRESS (City, State, and ZIP Code)		PROGRAM ELEMENT NO.	PROJECT NO.
		TASK NO.	WORK UNIT ACCESSION NO.
11. TITLE (Include Security Classification) The Training and Utilization of Army National Guard Senior Service College Fellows, 1987-92			
12. PERSONAL AUTHOR(S) Tennill, Clinton L., Jr., LTC			
13a. TYPE OF REPORT Study Project	13b. TIME COVERED FROM _____ TO _____	14. DATE OF REPORT (Year, Month, Day) 1992 May 28	15. PAGE COUNT 120
16. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTATION			
17. COSATI CODES		18. SUBJECT TERMS (Continue on reverse if necessary and identify by block number)	
FIELD	GROUP	SUB-GROUP	
19. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse if necessary and identify by block number) Since the Army National Guard first began participation in the U.S. Army War College's Senior Service College Fellowship Program, during Academic Year 1987, some thirty-six ARNG officers have completed the program. This study provides the first in-depth analysis of the unique skills and backgrounds ARNG officers bring to the SSC Fellowship Program. The report traces the development and expansion of the ARNG's involvement in the program from 1987 through 1992. It also analyzes the research topics completed by the ARNG SSC Fellows, and their follow-on assignments, as it determines if a relationship exists between the participants' research efforts and their subsequent military duties. The majority of the study deals with evaluating program data obtained from mail surveys returned by the ARNG SSC Fellows. Program problem areas, possible solutions, and recommendations for further program improvements are included in the study.			
20. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY OF ABSTRACT ☐ UNCLASSIFIED/UNLIMITED ☒ SAME AS RPT. ☐ DTIC USERS		21. ABSTRACT SECURITY CLASSIFICATION	
22a. NAME OF RESPONSIBLE INDIVIDUAL HENRY L. VAN BREDERODE, LTC, AD		22b. TELEPHONE (Include Area Code) 717/245-3044	22c. OFFICE SYMBOL AWCA

**THE TRAINING AND UTILIZATION OF ARMY NATIONAL GUARD
SENIOR SERVICE COLLEGE FELLOWS, 1987 - 1992**

by

Lieutenant Colonel Clinton L. Tennill Jr., AR
Army National Guard of the United States

U.S. Army War College Senior Service College Fellow
Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy,
Tufts University
Medford, Massachusetts

28 May 1992

ABSTRACT

AUTHOR: Clinton L. Tennill Jr., LTC, AR
TITLE: The Training and Utilization of Army National Guard
Senior Service College Fellows, 1987 - 1992
FORMAT: Individual Study Project
DATE: 28 May 1992 PAGES: 120 CLASS: Unclassified

Since the Army National Guard first began participation in the U.S. Army War College's Senior Service College Fellowship Program, during Academic Year 1987, some thirty-six ARNG officers have completed the program. This study provides the first in-depth analysis of the unique skills and backgrounds ARNG officers bring to the SSC Fellowship Program. The report traces the development and expansion of the ARNG's involvement in the program from 1987 thru 1992. It also analyzes the research topics completed by the ARNG SSC Fellows, and their follow-on assignments, as it determines if a relationship exists between the participants' research efforts and their subsequent military duties. The majority of the study deals with evaluating program data obtained from mail surveys returned by the ARNG SSC Fellows. Program problem areas, possible solutions, and recommendations for further program improvements are included in the study.

The views expressed in this paper are those of the author and do not reflect the official policy or position of the National Guard Bureau, the Department of the Army, Department of Defense, or the U.S. Government.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ABSTRACT.....	ii
CHAPTER I Introduction.....	1
CHAPTER II History of the ARNG Senior Service College (SSC) Fellowship Program.....	7
CHAPTER III Research Methods Utilized.....	19
CHAPTER IV Research Findings.....	26
CHAPTER V Conclusions and Recommendations	71
APPENDIX 1 ARNG SSC Fellows by Academic Year.....	84
APPENDIX 2 Research Reports Done by ARNG SSC Fellows.....	86
APPENDIX 3 USAWC Senior Service College Fellowship Institutions - For Academic Year 1992.....	89
APPENDIX 4 Survey Instrument - Former ARNG SSC Fellows.....	90
APPENDIX 5 Survey Instrument - Current ARNG SSC Fellows....	102
ENDNOTES.....	114
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	116



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

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

The United States Army formally began its Senior Service College (SSC) Fellowship Program during the 1985-86 Academic Year. One of the main purposes for establishing the Fellowship Program was to increase opportunities for Active Army officers to attend a resident-level program for which Military Education Level-1 (MEL-1), (war-college level) credit could be awarded.

Completion of the nine to twelve-month SSC Fellowship Program results in the U.S. Army War College (USAWC) SSC Fellows receiving MEL-1 credit, the equivalent of having completed the ten-month Army War College resident course.

Beginning with the 1987 Academic Year, the Army National Guard (ARNG), was also authorized to participate in the USAWC's SSC Fellowship Program, with one ARNG Fellow attending the program that year. During the past six years, the ARNG's involvement in the USAWC SSC Fellowship program has expanded, to its' current level of nine ARNG SSC Fellows, for Academic Year 1992.

The ARNG SSC Fellows are currently located at four educational institutions in the Eastern United States. With the completion of the U.S. Army War College's 1992 Academic Year, in June 1992, a total of thirty-six ARNG officers will have completed the USAWC's SSC Fellowship Program (see APPENDIX 1 for a listing of all ARNG SSC Fellowship Program participants).

The purpose of my study was to provide an unclassified research effort that examines at the research topics chosen by current, and former, ARNG SSC Fellow

A second purpose of the study was to determine if there have been any significant relationships between the ARNG SSC Fellows' research efforts and their follow-on assignments in the ARNG, either in the Title 10 AGR Tour Program, or back in their respective states, in ARNG troop unit assignments.

The reason I selected doing my research report on the ARNG's SSC Fellowship program was simple. After doing some preliminary hunting, for copies of research reports done by previous ARNG SSC Fellows at Tufts University, I found no information was readily available.

There was no central listing of research reports done by the ARNG SSC Fellows during previous years, nor were there copies of their research reports available in the Fletcher School Library, at Tufts University. It was also unknown if the previous research papers had been individual efforts, or were group projects.

I later discovered there was no information locally available as to what former ARNG SSC Fellows, at the other fellowship institutions (Harvard, Ohio State University, and the Center for Strategic and International Studies), had written about during their research efforts in previous years.

I then checked with several National Guard Bureau (NGB) agencies for information about research reports done by former ARNG SSC Fellows. Since prospective ARNG SSC Fellows must apply thru

NGB's Education Branch, (an agency of the ARNG's Operations and Training Division, NGB-ARO-E, located at Edgewood Arsenal, Maryland), I contacted the ARNG SSC Fellows Point-of-Contact there, Mr. Harry Gilman.

Mister Gilman advised me the missions of the ARNG's Education Branch were: to process the SSC nomination packets; to assist the ARNG's SSC Selection Board; to advise State Adjutants General (TAGs), and individual Guard members, of their selection for the program; to set up and conduct the ARNG's two-day SSC Orientation Seminar held at NGB, in Washington, D.C., each May; and to coordinate ARNG funding and administrative support essential for the program, between NGB's Education Branch and the U.S. Army War College.

In the following weeks and months, my phone calls, research visits and correspondence with other agencies (U.S. Army War College, NGB Education Branch, Army National Guard Personnel Center, etc.,) confirmed my suspicions.

Today, there is no single National Guard Bureau office or agency that maintains records on: the ARNG SSC Fellows' research efforts; their follow-on assignments; or knows whether there has been any relationship between the ARNG SSC Fellows' research efforts, and the use of those research skills in their later assignments.

The U.S. Army War College does maintain copies of all research reports produced by those ARNG SSC Fellows who were required, under written agreement with the SSC Fellowship institution, to produce

a research report. However, a mandatory research report is not required by all institutions hosting USAWC SSC Fellows.

At the Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy, a graduate institution of Tufts University, ARNG SSC Fellows are "encouraged" but not required, by the U.S. Army War College, to produce a research report.

The ARNG SSC Fellows at Ohio State University, in Columbus, Ohio, and the Center for Strategic and International Studies, in Washington, D.C., also are not required to do research papers (however, all nine ARNG SSC Fellows for Academic Year 1992 are producing research reports, whether required or not).

In the past, the National Guard Bureau has shown little interest in what the ARNG SSC Fellows have done (or not done), during their fellowship year. Also, there is no repository at NGB concerning the ARNG SSC Fellows' research efforts.

Currently, it is up to the ARNG SSC Fellows themselves, to determine their research paper's distribution, with most sending copies only to their SSC institution advisor, and the U.S. Army War College, if required. Thus, NGB often never sees copies of the research efforts done by the ARNG SSC Fellows it sent to the USAWC SSC Fellowship Program.

Additionally, Title 10 AGR tour management officials at the Army National Guard Personnel Center (GUARDPERCEN), in Alexandria, Virginia, said they have no interest in what the ARNG SSC Fellows have done their research on. The GUARDPERCEN officials also said the research studies done by the ARNG SSC Fellows have no bearing

on the follow-on assignments they are selected for. To date, thirty-one of the thirty-six (86%), of the ARNG SSC Fellows have been Title 10 AGR Tour Officers, whose follow-on assignments were determined by Tour Management officials, at GUARDPERCEN.

With these facts in mind, I thus selected as my research topic, "The Training and Utilization of Army National Guard Senior Service College Fellows, 1987 - 1992."

I hope as a minimum, my research findings will provide future ARNG SSC Fellows with a listing of the research efforts completed by former ARNG SSC Fellows (see APPENDIX 2 for a listing of former research reports done by ARNG SSC Fellows).

Perhaps, by knowing what has been done before, future ARNG SSC Fellows can get some ideas for new research efforts, or for further research in a topic area that has been previously addressed.

My research efforts included developing and mailing out survey questionnaires to all current, and former, ARNG SSC Fellows. Additionally, I conducted field visits and personal interviews with: officials at NGB's Education Branch, Edgewood Arsenal, Maryland; several former ARNG SSC Fellows, now serving on staff assignments in the Pentagon; AGR Tour Management officers at GUARDPERCEN, in Alexandria, Virginia; and with several training officials at NGB's Operations and Training Division, Arlington Hall Station, Virginia.

In my survey questionnaire, I sought information from current and former ARNG SSC Fellows concerning their research efforts; the

facilities and programs available at their respective fellowship institutions; their ideas and suggestions about how the ARNG SSC Fellowship program can be improved; and some demographic information about themselves, their military and civilian educations, and their military careers.

My findings and recommendations are discussed in the following chapters. Hopefully, some of the good ideas and recommendations made by former and current ARNG SSC Fellows, in their survey comments, can be incorporated into the ARNG SSC Fellowship Program in future years, by the National Guard Bureau and the U.S. Army War College.

CHAPTER 2

HISTORY OF THE ARNG SENIOR SERVICE COLLEGE FELLOWSHIP PROGRAM

The U.S. Army War College, the oldest of America's military Senior Service Colleges, was established by U.S. Army General Order 155, on November 27, 1901.¹

Founded by the Secretary of War (at that time), Elihu Root, the first annual session of the U.S. Army War College began on November 1, 1904, with nine Army officer students. One of the nine students was Capt. John J. Pershing, who later became the most famous alumnus of that first Army War College class.²

Over the past eight decades, the two-fold mission of the U.S. Army War College has remained much the same: "to prepare selected military officers and civilians for senior leadership responsibilities in a strategic environment during peace and war;" and "to study the role of landpower, as part of a joint or combined force, in support of the U.S. national military strategy."³

As the U.S. Army's officer corps increased in size during the post-World War II years, the need for Senior Service College graduates became more crucial for the senior Army leadership.

By the mid-1960's it had become apparent the U.S. Army could not continue to meet its Army War College graduate requirements solely through those officers attending the ten-month resident course, held annually at the U.S. Army War College, Carlisle Barracks, Pennsylvania.

In July 1968, the U.S. Army War College began instruction in its second Military Education Level-1 (MEL-1) producing program, with the start of its USAWC Non-Resident Course.⁴ This program, now known as the U.S. Army War College Corresponding Studies Course (CSC), is a two-year program, conducted on the graduate level.

The students of the USAWC Corresponding Studies Course are primarily of U.S. Army, Army National Guard (ARNG), and U.S. Army Reserve (USAR), lieutenant colonels and colonels. However, each year several U.S. Marine Corps Reserve officers and some Department of the Army (DA) civilian employees are also selected for enrollment in the two-year USAWC CSC Program.⁵

The enrollment quota for each class, which starts every July, is 350 students. The USAWC CSC Program and the USAWC Resident Course are based upon similar core curriculums, with the CSC Program designed to "mirror" or "correspond with" the regular resident program of instruction.

The demands of the CSC Program are very rigorous, requiring strict time-management, daily study, the conduct of critical analysis, and the preparation of numerous written reports on complex national security and defense issues.

Since the CSC student officers also hold fulltime military, or civilian positions (for ARNG and USAR officers), completion of most CSC course requirements usually occurs after the regular work day. This requires a very substantial time commitment during by the CSC students during evening hours, and on their non-duty weekends.

The USAWC CSC Program is the only non-resident MEL-1 course offered by the Senior Service Colleges (Army, Navy, Air Force, National War College, and the Industrial College of the Armed Forces), which also requires periods of resident attendance.

Those First-Year USAWC Corresponding Studies Course students who satisfactorily complete all six first-year course phases are then certified by their commands as being "academically qualified" to attend the Midcourse Resident Phase. This two-week phase is held annually at the U.S. Army War College, Carlisle Barracks, Pennsylvania, during the last two weeks of June.⁶

The Midcourse Resident Phase gives the CSC Program students the opportunity to apply and expand the knowledge gained during their first year of the course. It also serves as an introduction to the second year's course of instruction.

Completion of the five phases of the second year of the USAWC Corresponding Studies Course qualifies the officer to attend the final two-week End-of-Course Resident Phase, held annually in July.

At this second resident phase, the student completes the remainder of the required twenty-two days of resident academic instruction. The CSC Program graduation ceremony then occurs at Carlisle Barracks, on the last day of instruction.

The U.S. Army War College's third MEL-1 producing program is the Senior Service College Fellowship Program (SSCFP). This program first began in 1972, being called the Army Research Associate (ARA) Program. Several years later, it was renamed the Army Update Program.⁷

The initial purpose of the ARA Program was to improve "dialogue" between the U.S. Army, and those civilian academic institutions interested in national security affairs. Selected U.S. Army officers with "appropriate credentials" (advanced degrees), and experience, could volunteer for a one-year Army "sabbatical" to attend American universities, or research centers.

Although the ARA student officers enjoyed academic freedom to pursue the areas of study they desired, they were required by the Army to attend two USAWC National Security Seminars. Also, the ARA "fellows" were required to attend, as observers, the End-of-Course Resident Phase for the Second-Year USAWC CSC Program students.

Further evolution of the ARA Program into the current Senior Service College Fellowship Program occurred as a result of the Army's 1985 Professional Development of Officers Study (PDOS), and the 1987 Senior Military Schools' Review Board (SMSRB).⁸

One of the major recommendations resulting from the Army's 1985 Professional Development of Officers Study was that all Army lieutenant colonels (on active duty), should be MEL-1 graduates, of a Senior Service College or other "equivalent school," prior to being promoted to the grade of colonel, (O-6).⁹

A 1990 study of the Army's MEL-1 requirements, by a group of USAWC resident students (Gresh, Pryplesch, Reed, Chappell, Frey, Hayes, Johnson, Moberg and Polin), found that by 1990, 75% of all U.S. Army colonels serving on active duty, were MEL-1 educated.¹⁰

Another 1990 finding, from the U.S. Army's General Officer Management Office (GOMO), revealed that 96.7% of all General

Officers from the tri-services (Army, Air Force, Navy-Marine Corps), and 99.2% of all U.S. Army (active duty) General Officers were MEL-1 Graduates.¹¹

As a result of the 1985 Professional Development of Officers Study, the U.S. Army, under the guidance of the Army Chief of Staff, Gen. John Wickham, modified the Army Update Program. Beginning in Academic Year 1985, under General Wickham's direction, was a new program, called the Army Fellowship Program, with five U.S. Army officers attending Harvard's Kennedy School of Government for a one-year fellowship.¹²

For Academic Year 1986, (August 1985 - June 1986), the new Army Fellowship Program consisted of ten U.S. Army "fellows," all attending Harvard. The new "fellows" program was then being administered by the U.S. Army's degree completion and funded graduate program office, based at Ft. Benjamin Harrison, Indiana.

The Army "fellows" program at Harvard University continued to grow during Academic Year 1987, with ten Active Army officers, and the ARNG's first fellow attending that year. The Harvard program became multi-service in 1987, with three Air Force Fellows and one fellow each from the Air National Guard, and the U.S. Navy.

In Academic Year 1988, responsibility for the Army Fellows Program was shifted from the Army's degree completion and funded graduate program office, at Ft. Benjamin Harrison, Indiana, to the U.S. Army War College, at Carlisle Barracks, Pennsylvania.

With the U.S. Army War College now administering the program, it was renamed the USAWC SSC Fellowship Program in Academic Year

1988, with the number of SSC Fellows more than tripling in size, going from eleven, to thirty-six. By AY-1990, the program had increased to forty-one SSC Fellows, then rose to forty-five fellows for Academic Year 1991.

For Academic Year 1992, there are currently forty-three USAWC SSC Fellows (see APPENDIX 3 for a listing of USAWC SSC Fellowship Institutions for Academic Year 1992).¹³

Today's USAWC SSC Fellowship Program can best be characterized as providing an alternative track for Army officers to conduct serious research in a particular strategic, or specialized area of study.

A second point supporting the rapid growth of the USAWC SSC Fellowship Program was that it provided an opportunity for the Army to increase its resident seating capacity for MEL-1 education. This latter reason has become the driving force behind expansion of the USAWC SSC Fellowship Program in recent years.¹⁴

The SSC fellowships vary in length from nine to twelve months, depending upon the institution, or agency, being attended. The annual fellowships usually begin in late July, with a five-day orientation, to include three days at the U.S. Army War College, Carlisle Barracks, Pennsylvania, followed by two days with the Army Staff, at the Pentagon, in Washington, D.C.

Later in the academic year, the SSC Fellows again return to the U.S. Army War College, to attend a one-week residency phase, with the USAWC resident students (usually held in December).

The USAWC SSC Fellowships currently fall into two program categories. The first category, "Strategic Fellowships," are based at U.S. academic institutions which provide an equivalent strategically oriented educational experience similar to the Army War College resident curriculum.

The second category of fellowships, "Specialized Fellowships," combine a highly technical curriculum with the opportunity for exposure to the highest levels of decisionmaking, within an area of concentration.¹⁵

Current USAWC "Specialized Fellowships" are ongoing with such federal agencies as: the Foreign Service Institute (Department of State); Department of Justice; Central Intelligence Agency; Drug Enforcement Administration; Department of Health and Human Services, and with the NATO Defense College, in Rome, Italy.

Prior to 1990, officers chosen by the Department of the Army SSC Selection Board for Senior Service College resident attendance, were not given a choice of attending the Army War College resident course, or an SSC Fellowship. Rather, they were assigned to school positions, by the Department of the Army SSC Selection Board.

The policy was changed beginning in Academic Year 1991, by the Army Chief of Staff (then Gen. Carl Vouno), when he directed that all future U.S. Army SSC Fellowships would be filled only by program volunteers. This policy continues in effect today, with all Active Army SSC Fellows having specifically volunteered for the program.¹⁶

The Army National Guard first became involved in the Army Fellows Program during Academic Year 1987. Prior to that date, both the ARNG and the USAR had annually received Reserve Component student quotas (usually ten per component, per year), to attend the U.S. Army War College resident course. Additionally, both ARNG and USAR officers had been allowed to participate in the USAWC Corresponding Studies Course Program since its inception.

However, with the increasing emphasis being placed on MEL-1 education by the U.S. Army, as a result of its 1985 Professional Development of Officers Study, National Guard Bureau officials realized the ARNG also needed additional avenues for its officers to obtain MEL-1 certification, to include participation in the new USAWC SSC Fellowship Program.

In 1986, Lt. Gen. Herbert R. Temple Jr., then Chief of the National Guard Bureau, coordinated with the Army Chief of Staff, to allow ARNG officers to also participate in the USAWC SSC Fellowship Program, with NGB paying the program costs for ARNG participants.

A California Army National Guard officer, LTC Roger L. Goodrich Jr., who had been on a Title 10 AGR tour with the Army Comptroller's Congressional Liaison Office, became the first ARNG participant in the Army Fellows Program. For Academic Year 1987, he attending a ten-month resident fellowship at Harvard University, in Cambridge, Massachusetts.

After completing his SSC Fellowship, Colonel Goodrich served as chief of NGB's Policy and Liaison office for two years, before returning to California, where he now serves as Public Affairs

Officer for the California National Guard. His weekend ARNG troop unit assignment is aviation brigade commander, for California's 40th Infantry (Mech) Division.

According to Colonel Goodrich, the SSC Fellowship Program was significantly different in its early years. The AY-1987 Harvard Fellows marked only the third year for the fellows program, which was then still being managed by the Army's degree completion and funded graduate program office, at Ft. Benjamin Harrison, Indiana.

The Army fellows were, according to Colonel Goodrich, being treated like graduate students by Ft. Benjamin Harrison officials, with the 1987 Harvard Fellows strongly recommending the U.S. Army War College take over management of the Fellows Program (which occurred the next year, for Academic Year 1988).

Being the first ARNG SSC Fellow, Colonel Goodrich reported that all of his program activities and support "plowed new ground." However, with NGB's senior leadership being most supportive, he encountered no insurmountable problems during AY-1987, as the first ARNG SSC Fellow.¹⁷

With the U.S. Army War College assuming responsibility for the SSC Fellowship Program in Academic Year 1988, the program soon flourished, as did the ARNG's involvement in the USAWC SSC program.

Starting with one SSC Fellow for AY 1987, the Army Guard's participation in the program increased to: two fellows for AY-1988; six fellows for AY-1989; eight fellows in AY-1990; and ten fellows for AY-1991. For Academic Year 1992, there are nine ARNG USAWC SSC Fellows.

The ARNG SSC Fellowships were limited to Harvard University for the first two years (AY-1987 and AY-1988) it participated in the program. Beginning in Academic Year 1989, the ARNG added: three SSC fellowship positions at the Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy, Tufts University, in Medford, Massachusetts; and one fellowship at Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio; thus increasing the annual ARNG SSC Fellowship total to six.¹⁸

For Academic Year 1990, the ARNG retained its six existing USAWC SSC Fellowship positions (two at Harvard, three at Tufts, and one at Ohio State), while adding two new fellowship positions at the Center for Strategic and International Studies (CSIS), in Washington, D.C., for a total of eight ARNG SSC Fellows.

In Academic Year 1991, the number of ARNG fellowships increased by two, to a total of ten, with the addition of a fourth SSC Fellowship at Tufts University, and one ARNG fellowship at the NATO Defense College, in Rome Italy.¹⁹

For Academic Year 1992, the ARNG has nine SSC Fellows: four at Tufts University; two at Harvard University, two at the Center for Strategic and International Studies, and one at Ohio State University (the ARNG's SSC Fellowship at the NATO Defense College was a one-time occurrence, only for AY-1991).

The number of ARNG SSC Fellows for Academic Year 1993, will increase by one, to ten, when the ARNG adds its first "Specialized Fellowship," with the U.S. Drug Enforcement Agency (DEA), in Washington D.C. The remaining nine "Strategic Fellowships" for AY-1993, will be at the same four institutions, and in the same

numbers as for Academic Year-1992, (see APPENDIX 1, for a list of all ARNG SSC Fellows, for Academic Years 1987 thru 1992).²⁰

The future of the ARNG's SSC Fellowship Program for Academic Year 1994, and beyond, has greatly increased in importance during the past several months. In a recent NGB-GO-AR Memorandum, to the state TAGs, NGB announced the Army Chief of Staff, Gen. Gordon Sullivan, has initiated a change in Army Regulation 135-156, Personnel Management of General Officers. This change will require completion of MEL-1 education, for all promotions to general officer in the U.S. Army's Reserve Components (ARNG and USAR), effective January 1, 1996.²¹

As a result of this action, a Reserve Component MEL-1 Task Force was established in April 1992, to study the new requirement. Task Force representation includes: officials from the U.S. Army War College; the office of the Army's Deputy Chief of Staff, Operations (DCSOPS); and representatives from the National Guard Bureau and U.S. Army Reserve Command Headquarters.

Meeting at the U.S. Army War College, April 24, 1992, the task force members agreed on the new MEL-1 requirement for promotion to brigadier general, in the Army's Reserve Components.

However, task force members also agreed the implementation date should be delayed, from January 1, 1996, to October 1, 1996, to give Reserve Component personnel managers and the state TAGs more time to react, and select officers for MEL-1 course attendance.

The proposed change to Army Regulation 135-156, recommended by the RC MEL-1 Task Force on April 24, 1992, reads: "Effective 1 October 1996, colonels must have completed the Army War College or its equivalent (CSC Program, or SSC Fellowship), to be considered for Federal recognition to the grade of brigadier general."²²

If this requirement change is indeed implemented for ARNG and USAR promotions to brigadier general, effective in 1996, it will have a significant impact on the future size, and selection procedures, for the Army National Guard's SSC Fellowship Program, as well as for ARNG quotas for the U.S. Army War College resident and Corresponding Studies Programs.

It appears the senior Army leadership is indeed serious about further implementing "One Army" policies concerning military education and promotion requirements for Reserve Component officers. How the ARNG and USAR leadership will react to this new requirement, and the impact it will have on their SSC selection procedures, remains to be seen.

CHAPTER 3

RESEARCH METHODS UTILIZED

I found no previous survey information dealing solely with the Army National Guard SSC Fellows. The U.S. Army War College first surveyed its graduates from the USAWC resident and CSC Programs in 1988. However, no data about the USAWC SSC Fellowship Program was included in the 1988 survey, due to the small number of SSC program graduates at that time.²³

In April 1990, the U.S. Army War College conducted its second survey of MEL-1 graduates, mailing surveys out to 1,673 officers, to include 103 SSC Fellowship Program graduates. Of the 103 SSC Fellowship alumni mailed surveys, ninety-six went to Active Army officers, and seven went to former ARNG SSC Fellows.²⁴

The responses to the 1990 USAWC alumni survey totalled 1,179, an overall response rate of 70.5%. Of the 103 SSC Fellows surveyed, sixty-nine were completed and returned, for an SSC Fellows response rate of 66.9%.²⁵

Although there were separate breakouts of the 1990 alumni survey data, for Resident, CSC Program, and SSC Fellowship respondents, no differentiation was made concerning the SSC Fellows' component, so it is unknown how many (if any), of the sixty-nine SSC Fellows survey respondents were ARNG officers.

After spending more than a month considering several ARNG-related topics for my research efforts, I finally selected the ARNG

SSC Fellowship Program as my topic. A deciding factor had been the lack of ARNG SSC Fellowship Program information available, to include research topics completed by former ARNG SSC Fellows in previous years.

After discussing my proposal with Dr. Richard Shultz, director of the Fletcher School's International Security Studies Program (ISSP), my research proposal was approved and then submitted to the Army War College's SSC Fellowship Coordinator's Office, for approval, in mid-October 1991.

Officials at the U.S. Army War College had two concerns about my research proposal. The first concern was that my SSC survey might duplicate much information already obtained from SSC Fellows in the 1990 USAWC alumni survey. I explained that my survey would be mailed only to ARNG SSC Fellows, with almost all of the questions addressing issues and topics unique to ARNG officers.

The second concern was since I was surveying current and former USAWC SSC Fellows, even though they were all ARNG officers, my survey instrument needed to be reviewed and approved by the Directorate of Academic Affairs, at the Army War College, before it could be mailed out.

During November 1991, I obtained the names and addresses of all thirty-five current, or former, ARNG SSC Fellows. Most information was provided by NGB's Education Branch, at Edgewood Arsenal, Maryland, and from NGB's Tour Management Office, at GUARDPERCEN. I also developed a draft survey, pretesting some of the questions on the ARNG SSC Fellows at Tufts University.

The criteria used in determining the survey recipients was as follows. First, the surveys would go only to ARNG officers, who had completed, or were currently in, the USAWC Senior Service College Fellowship Program. Secondly, the surveys would go only to "active" ARNG officers (the program is so new, none of the ARNG SSC Fellows have yet retired from military service). Race, gender, and age were considered insignificant factors, and thus not addressed in the survey instrument.

During the U.S. Army War College's "Residency Week" for the SSC Fellows, in early December 1991, I visited Carlisle Barracks, and justified and defended my survey instrument with USAWC officials from the Office of the SSC Fellowship Coordinator, and the Directorate of Academic Affairs. As a result of the discussions, I had to revise my survey instrument into two separate surveys. Since I had asked questions, in the past tense for previous fellows, (and present tense, for current fellows), all in the same question, many of the survey questions appeared confusing.

The end result was I developed two different fifty-question surveys, varying only in tense (past tense for former fellows, present tense for current fellows), for most survey questions. One question (#47), had to be reworded, as it asked former ARNG Fellows how many of their Post-MEL-1 assignments they considered "appropriate" for a MEL-1 graduate. For the current fellows, Question 47 asked what type assignment, and on what level staff, they considered appropriate for an ARNG officers who were MEL-1 graduates.

About the only other difference between the two survey documents was on the title page of the surveys going to current fellows, where a second line appeared with the survey title, reading "(AY 1991-92 ARNG SSC Fellows)". (see APPENDIX 4 for a copy of the survey instrument mailed to former ARNG Fellows, and APPENDIX 5 for the survey sent to current ARNG SSC Fellows).

In early January 1992, after making the suggested survey revisions and faxing copies of the revised surveys to the Directorate of Academic Affairs Office, at the Army War College, my survey instruments were finally approved. However, before I could mail them out, the Army War College requested that I also have the surveys approved by "appropriate officials" at the National Guard Bureau.

During the week of 6 - 10 January 1992, I flew to Washington, D.C., to conduct personal interviews with former ARNG SSC fellows now assigned at the Pentagon. That same week, I hand-carried my survey documents through appropriate agencies at the National Guard Bureau, having the surveys reviewed and approved by: NGB's Education Branch (Mr. Bob Bailey, and Mr. Harry Gilman); and the Tour Management Office (COL Cleveland Lott and LTC Tom Tucker), at GUARDPERCEN. I also left copies of the surveys with the NGB's Operations and Training Directorate (NGB-ARO), for COL Dennis Wampler, who was on TDY, out of the country, at the time of my visit.

After obtaining all the required survey approvals, from both NGB and the U.S. Army War College, my surveys were then duplicated.

Finally, after two months of survey revisions and gaining approvals from the Army War College, and NGB, my surveys were mailed on January 31, 1992. I sent them by first-class mail, along with a cover letter and a pre-addressed postage-paid return envelope.

Thirty-five surveys were mailed out, with twenty-seven going to former ARNG SSC Fellows and eight copies to current fellows (there are actually thirty-six ARNG SSC Fellows, but I excluded myself from the survey). As I was surveying the entire population of ARNG SSC Fellows (other than myself), my sampling method was a "census," rather than a representative sampling.

The survey consisted of fifty questions, with short answer, bar-scale questions, and multiple response answers. The survey was divided into four parts. Part I (questions 1 thru 15), covered the SSC Fellows Orientation Program and the fellows' research efforts and topics.

Part II (questions 16 thru 25), asked questions about the SSC Fellowship Program in general, and the facilities and resources available at each of the respective fellowship locations.

Part III (questions 26 thru 36), consisted of general information questions, to include out-of-pocket costs; expansion of the Fellows Program to include USAR officers; and questions seeking ideas on how the fellowship program could be further improved.

Finally, Part IV (questions 37 thru 50), asked for demographic information about the ARNG fellows, to their source of commission, military and civilian education levels, and the types of units and levels at which they had commanded.

Within one month, I had received twenty-six surveys back, for a response rate of 74.3 percent. I then made follow-up phone calls to non-respondents within CONUS, and mailed a second survey, with a "reminder" notice to the non-respondents based overseas. These actions resulted in five more surveys being returned during the next five weeks. Thus, I ended up receiving surveys from thirty-one of thirty-five ARNG SSC Fellows contacted, for a most acceptable survey return rate of 88.6%.

Although the respondents weren't asked to identify themselves on the survey, based upon the postmarks on the return envelopes and the respondents' answers to questions about his SSC Fellowship location, research topic and basic branch, I was able to determine who each respondent was.

Since I had assured all participants of confidentiality in their survey comments, any remarks cited in the next chapter, (research findings), will be identified only by the institution attended (Harvard Fellow, etc.), so the identity of the respondents remains unknown.

Of the four non-respondents to the survey, two were Title 10 AGR tour officers with U.S. Army units in Germany. Since the unit addresses was more than a year old and one unit had been scheduled to inactivate in 1991, I can assume these two ARNG SSC Fellows never received either the original survey, or the follow-up query, with both being lost somewhere in the military mail system.

A third survey non-respondant, when contacted by phone, assured me he had put the completed survey in the return mail, so it also

might have been lost in the mail. The fourth individual, a Title 10 ER tour officer, failed to return my phone calls when I attempted to contact him. I assume he was either too busy, or disinterested, to take time to complete and return the survey.

I was, however, very pleased with the 88.6% response rate that I received from the thirty-one ARNG SSC Fellows who did respond. Such a high response rate results in the survey findings being statistically significant, with a high level of confidence achieved for the responses.

The research findings, along with some comments and observations made by various respondents, are contained in the next chapter, research findings.

CHAPTER 4

RESEARCH FINDINGS

After coding and analyzing the thirty-one survey responses received, I found some very significant trends and survey comments from the ARNG SSC Fellows who had responded. Since the fifty-question survey was divided into four categories, the research findings will be discussed under the category which they appeared.

PART I - FELLOWSHIP ORIENTATION AND RESEARCH EFFORTS

Question 1 asked, "Should the National Guard Bureau and/or the Army National Guard Directorate provide ARNG SSC Fellows with a list of ARNG-related topics which they would like researched?" The Department of the Army currently provides such a list of proposed research topics to all SSC Fellows. The responses are indicated in Table 1, below.

TABLE 1 - NGB/ARNG DIRECTORATE SHOULD PROVIDE RESEARCH TOPICS:

ANSWER:	RESPONSES:	PERCENT:
Strongly Agree	11	35.5%
Agree	15	48.4%
Neutral	2	6.5%
Disagree	3	9.7%
Strongly Disagree	0	0.0%
Total:		100%

FINDINGS: Twenty-six of the thirty-one respondents (83.9%), either strongly agreed, or agreed that NGB, or the ARNG Directorate should provide ARNG SSC Fellows with a list of ARNG-related topics they would like researched.

Question 2 was similarly worded, asking, "should the State Adjutant General (TAG), provide research topic input for M-Day, Title 32, or Military Technician officers from his state who will be attending an ARNG SSC Fellowship?" The responses are indicated in Table 2.

TABLE 2 - SHOULD STATE TAG PROVIDE RESEARCH IDEAS?

ANSWER:	RESPONSES:	PERCENT:
Strongly Agree	3	9.7%
Agree	13	41.9%
Neutral	7	22.6%
Disagree	5	16.1%
Strongly Disagree	3	9.7%
Total:		100%

FINDINGS: Responses indicated the SSC Fellows were "lukewarm" about the State TAGs providing research input, with 52.4% either strongly agreeing, or agreeing, while 48.4% were either neutral, or disagreed with the idea. Of major significance was the fact that thirty-one of the thirty-five ARNG SSC survey recipients (88.6%), are, or were, Title 10 AGR Tour officers at the time of their fellowship attendance. Thus, the idea of State TAG research input had little bearing on them. One survey respondent (a former Tufts Fellow), who "strongly disagreed," voiced his dissatisfaction by stating, "the purpose of the SSC Fellowships is to study issues of national and international concern, not from a state or lower perspective."

Question 3 asked the respondents, "given your choice in selecting a research topic, from which area did you choose to do your research in?" The choices, and the survey respondents'

replies, are listed below, in Table 3.

TABLE 3 - STUDY AREAS FOR RESEARCH TOPIC SELECTION:

RESEARCH TOPIC AREA:	RESPONSES:	PERCENT:
Active Army problem/issue	6	19.3%
National-level ARNG problem/issue	15	48.4%
State-related ARNG problem/issue	2	6.5%
Other military service issue	8	25.8%
Non-military topic	2	6.5%
Did not do a research project	1	3.2%
Total:	34*	109.7%

*NOTE: Total responses add up to thirty-four (109.7%), as three respondents indicated their research topics fell into two or more of the categories (joint issue, mobilization at state and national level, DoD budget, etc.)

FINDINGS: It is significant that thirty-one of the thirty-four responses (91.2%), dealt with some level of military issue. This means that given their choice of selecting any research topic, the vast majority of ARNG SSC Fellows chose to research and write on a military issue.

Question 4 asked the fellows, "when did you first formulate the topic that you did your research on?" The six response choices, and the respondents's answers, appear in Table 4.

TABLE 4 - WHEN WAS RESEARCH TOPIC FIRST SELECTED:

WHEN WAS TOPIC SELECTED:	RESPONSES:	PERCENT:
Prior to attending NGB SSC Orientation	6	19.4%
Based on issue presented at NGB Orient.	0	0.0%
Prior to reporting to SSC Institution	4	12.9%
Based on issue at USAWC/DA Orientation	2	6.5%
After beginning SSC Fellowship year	18	58.0%
Did not do a research project	1	3.2%
Total:	31	100%

FINDINGS: First, ten of the thirty respondents who did projects (33.3%), had selected their topic either before the NGB

SSC Orientation, or prior to reporting to their fellowship institution. Second, the vast majority of fellows, eighteen of thirty (60%), selected their research topic after beginning their fellowship year. Third, if either NGB, or DA, was trying to influence the ARNG Fellows in selecting a research topic, the idea didn't work, as only two of thirty fellows (6.5%), selected a DA recommended topic, with none of the fellows selecting a topic based on issues presented by NGB briefers, at the NGB SSC Orientation.

Question 5 asked, "what was the title of your research project?" A complete listing of all ARNG SSC Fellows research topics, from 1987 thru 1992, is contained in APPENDIX 2 to this paper.

Question 6 asked, "was your research project an individual effort, or a group project?"

FINDINGS: Of the thirty respondents who did research projects, eighteen (60%), had done individual projects, with twelve (40%) doing group projects.

Significant was the fact that nine of the ten ARNG SSC Fellows who attended Harvard, had participated in group projects, with the group size varying from two to five fellows. Yet, of the eight Harvard group projects worked on by ARNG fellows (two ARNG fellows had worked on the same project), only one dealt (partly) with a Reserve Component issue. Also, the one Harvard fellow to produce an individual project, had done it on an ARNG-related topic.

In contrast, nine of the eleven ARNG SSC Fellows who had

attended Tufts University's Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy, had done individual projects, five of which were ARNG-related. And, the two ARNG Fletcher fellows who worked on a group project, had done it on a Guard-related issue.

Thus, of the twelve ARNG fellows who had participated in group projects, nine (75%), were Harvard fellows. And, of the ten group projects worked on by ARNG SSC Fellows, only two were directly related to an ARNG issue.

Question 7 asked the ARNG SSC Fellows, "was there any relationship between your research effort and your follow-on AGR tour, (or ARNG troop unit assignment), if so, explain the relationship." This was one of the key survey responses for my research project, as one of my main objectives had been to determine if a relationship existed between the ARNG SSC Fellows' research efforts and their utilization in follow-on assignments.

FINDINGS: Of the thirty-one responses, nineteen fellows (61.3%), indicated no relationship between their research efforts and follow-on assignments. Five other fellows (16.1%), who were currently in the fellowship program (Class of '92), had not yet learned their follow-on assignments when they returned their surveys (February, 1992). Only seven ARNG Fellows (22.6%), indicated there had been any relationship between their SSC research efforts and their subsequent assignments.

Although a more detailed analysis of these research-related assignments will be addressed in Chapter 5 (Conclusions and Recommendations), some interesting observations can be made about

these individuals. All seven were Title 10 AGR officers, and all were combat arms officers (two infantry, two aviation, two engineer and one field artillery). Of their seven research projects, six had dealt with DA or DoD related issues, (the seventh dealt with performance of Army ROTC cadets). None of the seven projects had addressed a purely ARNG-related issue. Also, of the seven officers, five were serving in Pentagon assignments (two at NGB, one DA staff, one DoD staff, one JCS staff). The other two were serving at either a major army command, or an allied command. Four of the seven were already colonels, and a fifth was promoted to O-6 shortly after returning his survey.

Question 8 asked, "was adequate TDY funding available from NGB to cover expenses for all essential research travel?" For the past several years, NGB has provided TDY funding in the amount of \$3,500 per fellow, per year, to cover TDY travel expenses related to research activities. Responses to Question 8 appear in Table 5.

TABLE 5 - WAS ADEQUATE TDY FUNDING AVAILABLE FOR RESEARCH:

ANSWER:	RESPONSES:	PERCENT:
Strongly Agree	10	32.3%
Agree	17	54.9%
Neutral	2	6.4%
Disagree	1	3.2%
Strongly Disagree	1	3.2%
Total:		100%

FINDINGS: The ARNG SSC Fellows did not see TDY funding as a problem, with twenty-seven responses (87.2%), either agreeing or strongly agreeing that adequate TDY funding was available.

Question 9, also related to SSC Fellows TDY funding, asked, "with the austere defense budgets projected for the future, which response is most valid, concerning TDY costs for ARNG SSC Fellows research efforts?" Responses are shown in Table 6.

TABLE 6 - FUTURE FUNDING FOR RESEARCH EFFORTS:

ANSWER:	RESPONSES:	PERCENT:
Increase TDY funding, if needed	5	16.1%
Keep current TDY funding level	17	54.9%
Reduce TDY funds to \$2,000-\$2,500	4	12.9%
Have ARNG Dir., or State TAG fund	3	9.7%
Seek support from host university	1	3.2%
Other: justify, then resource	1	3.2%
Total:		100%

FINDINGS: Twenty-two respondents (71%), thought TDY funds should remain at current levels, or be increased if needed, with four others opting to reducing funding somewhat. The idea of having the ARNG Directorate, or State TAGS, provide TDY support received less than 10% support, with only one response each, in the other two categories.

Question 10 asked, "which of the following organizations received a copy of your final research report? (Check as many as applicable)." Of the thirty-one survey responses, thirty ARNG SSC Fellows had produced research reports. The respondents were told to check as many of the five organizations, or agencies, as were applicable to their situation. Table 7, on the following page, shows where copies of the ARNG fellows' research findings were submitted.

TABLE 7 - ORGANIZATIONS RECEIVING RESEARCH REPORT COPIES:

ORGANIZATION:	RESPONSES:	PERCENT:
SSC Inst./Fellowship Advisor	27	90.0%
USAWC SSC Fellowship Coord.	27	90.0%
NGB, or ARNG staff agency	16	53.3%
State TAG, or State ARNG staff	5	16.7%
Copy to military pub./journal	9	30.0%
Total possible responses:		30 Multiple Resp.

FINDINGS: Twenty-seven of the thirty fellows (90%), sent copies of research efforts to their institutional fellowship advisor, and the USAWC SSC Fellowship Coordinator's office (these are the two agencies usually required to receive a copy of the research findings). Only about half the fellows sent reports to NGB. Copies going to the state TAGs, were usually from the M-Day SSC Fellows. Five of the nine reports submitted to a military journal went to NATIONAL GUARD magazine, for possible use in ARNG-related articles. The remaining four research reports went to either DoD agencies (copies of a group project, on a national-level issue), the Military Testing Association, or the U.S. Senate.

Question 11 addressed the National Guard Bureau's annual Senior Service College Orientation Program. This has been a two-day series of briefings, held at NGB each May, in which all of the new SSC resident students are given update briefings by each of the major ARNG directorates. The question asked, "did NGB's annual ARNG SSC Orientation Program provide the essential NGB and ARNG update briefings and background materials needed to prepare you for your SSC Fellowship?" Thirty of the thirty-one SSC Fellows had attended the orientation, with their responses shown in Table 8.

TABLE 8 - WAS THE NGB SSC ORIENTATION PROGRAM ADEQUATE:

ANSWER:	RESPONSES:	PERCENT:
Strongly agree	2	6.6%
Agree	15	50.0%
Neutral	9	30.0%
Disagree	4	13.4%
Strongly Disagree	0	0.0%
Total:		100%

FINDINGS: Seventeen (56.6%), of the SSC Fellows thought the NGB briefings had been beneficial, while thirteen (43.4%), were either neutral, or in disagreement with the statement. Comments from one dissenting fellow were, "one day of briefings will not adequately prepare anyone, nor even be necessarily relevant toward the pursuits of one's interests".

Question 12 cited the current program for the ten ARNG officers who annually attend the U.S. Army War College resident course, in which they are hosted by the USAWC, at Carlisle Barracks, Pennsylvania, just prior to the NGB Orientation. While at Carlisle Barracks, the incoming ARNG resident students receive orientations about the school, program of instruction, family quarters available, and services and facilities available to them and their families at the Army War College.

Question 12 asked, "would it greatly benefit the ARNG SSC Fellows if NGB would set up a one-day SSC Fellows Orientation, in Washington, D.C., just prior to the annual ARNG SSC Orientation Program?" The ARNG SSC Fellows' responses are reflected in Table 9, on the following page.

TABLE 9 - ESTABLISH AN NGB SSC FELLOWS ORIENTATION PROGRAM:

ANSWER:	RESPONSES:	PERCENT:
Strongly agree	5	16.1%
Agree	12	38.7%
Neutral	7	22.6%
Disagree	7	22.6%
Strongly disagree	0	0.0%
Total:		31 100%

FINDINGS: Seventeen of the thirty-one fellows (54.8%), agreed such a program would be helpful. But, the remaining fellows were equally divided, being either neutral, or in disagreement, with the idea. Of significance was the fact that of the seven fellows who disagreed with the value of the NGB SSC Fellows Orientation, five had come to their fellowships from NGB assignments, where they had spent from two to six years on the NGB staff.

Question 13 carried the idea of a one-day NGB-hosted SSC Fellowship Orientation further, asking, "if NGB were to hold a one-day SSC Fellows Orientation, which topic areas should be presented?" The fellows were told to rank order their preferences, for five possible topic areas that such an orientation might address. The topic areas are listed in Table 10.

TABLE 10 - POTENTIAL NGB SSC FELLOWSHIP ORIENTATION TOPICS:

TOPIC AREA:	RESPONSES:	FIRST CHOICE:
Selecting a research topic	23	5
Course selection/campus activities	23	2
Surviving at the fellowship site	26	8
Orientation on fellowship area	28	5
Life as an ARNG SSC Fellow	30	10
Other (specific comments)	4	0
Total:		134 30

FINDINGS: Of the thirty fellows answering the question, the most popular topic, Life as an ARNG SSC Fellow, received thirty votes, with ten ranking it as the number one issue. This indicates the new fellows were most concerned about learning, from a panel of former ARNG SSC Fellows, what was expected of them in their new roles and how best to "survive." All five of the specific topic areas received at least twenty-three responses (76.6%), indicating the new fellows were interested about campus activities, housing, military facilities, and services available at fellowship sites. Course selection, and picking a research topic, were of lesser immediate interest to the new fellows. The four "other" topics addressed concerns about: follow-on assignments; NGB support available to fellows; "burning issues" facing the ARNG in the near future; and, an orientation at the fellowship site, by the current ARNG SSC Fellows (the AY-92 Tufts Fellows held such a program, in May 1992, for three of the new AY-93 fellows coming to Tufts).

Question 14 asked the fellows, "how much attention did NGB, the appropriate ARNG Directorate, or your state TAG, take in reviewing the results of your SSC Fellowship research project?"

The responses are indicated in Table 11.

TABLE 11 - INTEREST IN RESEARCH PROJECT BY ARNG AGENCIES:

ANSWER:	RESPONSES:	PERCENT:
Strongly interested	4	13.3%
Some interest	4	13.3%
Neutral	5	16.7%
Little interest	5	16.7%
No interest	12	40.0%
Total		30
		100%

FINDINGS: The results to this question were distressing, with seventeen fellows (56.7%), indicating there had been little, or no interest, shown in their research efforts by ARNG agencies. Only eight fellows (26.6%), stated that an interest had been shown in their research efforts by Guard officials. Of significance was the fact that of those eight, six had come to their fellowships from Pentagon assignments (with four of the six returning to Pentagon assignments, following their fellowship).

Question 15, an open-ended question, asked the fellows, "how could NGB, the ARNG Directorate, or the State TAG, improve upon support provided to the ARNG SSC Fellows during the academic year?" Twenty-seven fellows responded with ideas and suggestions, while four chose not to comment.

FINDINGS: The significant responses, categorized by content type included: (1) establishing an NGB fellowship coordinator, or liaison, between NGB and the fellows, five responses; (2) better, or earlier coordination, of follow-on assignments with SSC Fellows, four responses; (3) that NGB should provide laptop computers and printers to fellows, three responses; (4) a better NGB SSC Fellows orientation, with TDY funding for an early visit (prior to reporting) to fellowship sites, three responses; (5) use of SSC Fellows to study/resolve ARNG-related issues, two responses; (6) better communication between NGB and the SSC Fellows ("call us every once in a while"), two responses; and (7), require the SSC Fellows to submit to NGB, an After-Action Report (AAR), of their fellowship year, or research milestones, two responses. Four SSC

Fellows offered no program improvements, stating that NGB's support was "more than adequate," (but, all four had left NGB assignments to attend their fellowships). And, three fellows were happy they had just been "left alone," to pursue their own interests.

PART II - SSC FELLOWSHIP PROGRAMS AND FACILITIES

Most questions asked in Part II were designed to compare the various the programs, activities, and facilities at each of the SSC fellowship sites. Some questions that were asked had been specifically requested by my research advisor, who wanted to see the comparison between programs and activities available at the various SSC institutions. Part II included Survey Questions 16 thru 25.

Question 16 listed ten activities usually scheduled during the SSC Fellowship year, by either NGB, the U.S. Army War College or other guard-related agencies. The fellows were asked, "during your SSC Fellowship year, indicate those activities you attended." The activities are listed in Table 12.

TABLE 12 - ACTIVITIES PARTICIPATED IN DURING FELLOWSHIP YEAR:

ACTIVITY:	RESPONSES:
NGB SSC Orientation, at the Pentagon (May)	26
Campus/Institution visit (prior to reporting)	25
USAWC and DA SSC Fellows Orientation (Jul./Aug.)	26
USAWC-sponsored New York City Trip (Oct.)	15
USAWC Resident Week, Carlisle Bks, PA. (Dec.)	29
USAWC National Security Seminar Week (June)	16
Visit to NGB, or GUARDPERCEN	16
Visit to State TAG/STARC Headquarters	8
Attended annual NGAUS General Conference	8
Attended state Natl. Guard Assn. Conference	12
Other (OCONUS travel, research trips, conferences)	7
Total Respondents:	31

FINDINGS: The ARNG SSC Fellows participated most in those activities sponsored by the U.S. Army War College. A little over half the fellows (51.6%), had visited either NGB, or GUARDPERCEN, during the fellowship year. But, only eight officers (25.8%), had visiting their State TAGs, or STARC Headquarters, during the year.

Question 17 queried the fellows about office facilities and equipment available to them at their SSC Fellowship institutions, asking, "which facilities/resources...were available to you at your SSC Fellowship site?"

FINDINGS: At all fellowship locations, the ARNG Fellows seemed well-equipped, having access to adequate office space, telephones, fax machines and Xerox machines. The lack of Personal Computers had appeared to be a problem at Tufts University, but the Fletcher School opened a new computer lab facility in October 1991, so that problem should be resolved.

Parking was a problem at some facilities, being unavailable in Washington, D.C., at the Center for Strategic and International Studies. Campus parking at Tufts University ran \$80 per year, while a few miles away, at Harvard, it cost \$325 per year. Facilities at Ohio State University seemed adequate in all categories.

NGB pays tuition and fee costs at most SSC institutions for each fellow. The costs, per ARNG SSC Fellow at each institution for Academic Year 1992, were: Tufts University, \$14,580; Harvard University, \$15,250; Center for Strategic and International Studies, \$12,000; Ohio State University, no fellowship charges.

Question 18 asked the fellows, "how many courses did you take at your SSC Fellowship institution each semester? Indicate "A" for courses audited, and "C" for courses taken for credit." The course loads, per semester, are shown in Table 13.

TABLE 13 - COURSES TAKEN PER SEMESTER BY ARNG SSC FELLOWS:

COURSES PER SEMESTER:	FALL SEMESTER:	SPRING SEMESTER:
None*	4	11
One	0	3
Two	5	8
Three	6	4
Four	5	0
Five	2	5
Six	3	0
Semester course averages:	3.5	1.8

*--CSIS is a "think tank" organization, offering no courses

FINDINGS: Since twenty-six of the thirty-one fellows (83.9%), already had advanced degrees, and with periodic absences from the institutions for USAWC activities (New York City trip, Resident Week, Security Seminar Week, etc.), and TDY trips for research activities, none of the ARNG SSC Fellows took any courses for academic credit. In addition to no classes being offered at CSIS, the Ohio State fellows are not required to take courses. The "average" course load for the fall semester was 3.5 courses per fellow, with the spring semester average being 1.8 courses.

Two major reasons for the decrease in spring semester course loads were: first, most SSC Fellows were heavily involved in completing research activities and writing their research papers; and second, Harvard requires its SSC Fellows to participate in the Senior Officials National Security (SONS) Seminars for eight weeks

during the spring semester. The Harvard SONS Program consists of lectures and presentations, running eight hours per day, for eight weeks, with significant nightly readings assigned.

Question 19 queried the SSC Fellows to account for how their time was utilized, asking, "on average, how many hour-per-week did you spend participating in (program) activities?" The activities are listed in Table 14.

TABLE 14 - AVERAGE HOURS PER WEEK ON ACADEMIC ACTIVITIES:

ACTIVITY:	HOURS PER WEEK:		MIN.	MAX.	AVERAGE	RESPONSES:
Class attendance	1	23			9.5	23
Course readings	1	40			12.5	22
Library/research proj. readings	2	30			11.7	30
Research prep/phone interviews	2	30			8.6	27
PT/physical conditioning	2	25			6.5	31
Guest speakers, lectures, etc.	1	12			4.1	31
Departmental/faculty programs	1	10			2.5	24

Average hours per week: 55.4

FINDINGS: The great variance in hours spent on each activity demonstrates the diversity of the SSC Fellowship Program. At those institutions where there are no classes (CSIS), a great deal more time is spent on readings and research efforts. All fellows found time for Physical Training, sometimes needed to burn off the calories gained attending guest speaker luncheons and dinners. When an additional five hours per week of "commuting time" is factored in (30 minutes each way, every day), the typical SSC Fellow spends more than 60 hours per week on fellowship activities.

Question 20 provided the fellows with a listing of activities and asked them, "which of the following activities did your SSC Fellowship institution make available for your participation?" The

responses are indicated in Table 15.

TABLE 15 - ACTIVITIES AVAILABLE AT SSC INSTITUTIONS:

ACTIVITY:	RESPONSES:
Guest speaker series (military, diplomatic)	31
Campus/departmental orientation, tour	22
Military conference/security studies seminar	28
Military ball/military social activities	18
International crisis simulation (wargame)	21
Field trips to local military/govt. agencies	18
OCONUS field trip (using military airlift)	19
Other: (SONS program, seminars, conferences)	4
Total possible responses: 31	

FINDINGS: All institutions provided adequate inprocessing and orientation activities, and all hosted a guest speaker series, with military, diplomatic and scholarly presentations. All institutions except CSIS, hosted military conferences and held a military ball or other social event. All institutions except Ohio State, held some type of "crisis simulation" exercise and field trips, within CONUS, to military installations. Only Harvard and the Fletcher School (Tufts University), offered OCONUS field trips. During the past three years, the Fletcher School OCONUS trips visited military and diplomatic facilities in: Hawaii, Alaska and Korea (1990); Panama and Honduras (1991); and Kuwait, Saudi Arabia, Bahrain, the United Arab Emirates and Great Britain (1992).

Question 21 addressed the issue of frequency of contact between the SSC Fellows, and other academic and military agencies, asking, "how often did you have contact (face-to-face, telephonic, or by mail), with the (list of) individuals or agencies during your fellowship year?" The listing of agencies, and the fellows' responses, are shown in Table 16.

TABLE 16 - FREQUENCY OF CONTACT WITH MILITARY/ACADEMIC AGENCIES:

AGENCY:	DAILY:	WEEKLY:	BIWEEKLY:	MONTHLY:	SELDOM:	NEVER:
Professors	15	8	0	0	0	7*
Research supv.	12	9	4	1	3	1**
Inst. director	3	8	4	3	5	8
From NGB/ARNG	0	1	0	2	11	17
You to NGB/ARNG	0	3	2	13	11	2
Your State TAG	0	0	0	3	11	17
State ARNG unit	0	1	0	2	9	19
Prev. assgmt.	0	1	1	5	17	7
GUARDPERCEN	0	1	1	8	18	3
USAWC SSC Coord.	3	7	5	13	2	1***
Other (tour off)	1	0	1	0	0	0

Total possible responses: 31

*-CSIS and OSU, don't take courses, no contact with professors

**-Didn't produce a research project

***-NATO Defense College Fellow, based in Rome, Italy

FINDINGS: Responses indicated SSC Fellows deal most frequently with course professors and research supervisors (usually daily or weekly), but have little contact with school deans or institutional heads. Contact from NGB, or the ARNG Directorate, to the SSC Fellows was very poor, with twenty-eight (90.3%), reporting such contact as either seldom, or never. Contact from the SSC Fellows to NGB, or the ARNG Directorate, was a little better, with eighteen fellows (58%), reporting contact of monthly, or or more frequently. The contact between SSC Fellows and their State TAGS and ARNG units was also very low. But, twenty-eight SSC Fellows (90.3%), reported contact with the USAWC SSC Fellowship Coordinator's Office as monthly, or better, with the support being provided to them rated as "excellent." The data shows that NGB, GUARDPERCEN, and the State TAGS, need to take a much greater interest in the ARNG SSC Fellows, and their activities.

Question 22 addressed the issue of institutional support to the fellows, asking, "how would you rate the support provided to you, in your research efforts, by the SSC institution?" The responses are indicated in Table 17.

TABLE 17 - INSTITUTIONAL SUPPORT PROVIDED TO SSC FELLOWS:

ANSWER:	RESPONSES:	PERCENT:
Very supportive	18	58.1%
Usually supportive	9	29.0%
Neutral	4	12.9%
Poorly supported	0	0.0%
No support	0	0.0%
Total:		100%

FINDINGS: Responses indicated the ARNG SSC Fellows were very satisfied with the support provided to them by their SSC institutions. Twenty-seven fellows (87.1%), rating the support they were provided as being either Supportive, or Very Supportive.

Question 23 dealt with support provided by various military agencies, asking the fellows, "how would you rate support provided during your SSC Fellowship by...state, regional, or national agencies." Responses, and support categories, appear in Table 18.

TABLE 18 - SUPPORT PROVIDED BY MILITARY AGENCIES:

AGENCY:	SUPPORT:	EXCELLENT	GOOD	SOME	POOR	NO SUPPORT
Local mil. spt. agency		12	14	2	1	2
Army War College staff		20	9	2	0	0
NGB agencies		7	15	5	2	2
GUARDPERCEN		5	12	8	2	4
State TAG/State STARC		5	7	6	1	12
Other (Sr. ARNG Adv, etc.)		2	0	1	0	0
Total responses possible:		31				

FINDINGS: Responses indicated the SSC Fellows seemed satisfied with the facilities and services available at nearby

federal military installations, with twenty-six of the thirty-one responses (83.8%), rating the services as either Excellent, or Good. Likewise, the ARNG SSC Fellows were very satisfied with the support they had received from the U.S. Army War College staff, with twenty-nine fellows (93.5%), rating the support as either Excellent, or Good. Evaluations of support provided by National Guard Bureau agencies were not as high, but the majority still rated NGB and GUARDPERCEN support in the Excellent, or Good categories. The lowest support ratings went to the State TAGS and STARC's, with twelve fellows (38.7%), indicating they received No Support during their fellowship year.

Question 24 was an "open-ended" question, asking, "what improvements could your host institution have made to improve the SSC Fellowship Program?"

FINDINGS: Of the thirty-one respondents, four thought the program was fine as is, and another six chose not to make comments. Among the twenty-one fellows who commented, seven believed the institutions needed better school orientations, and to provide fellows with more information in advance about housing, school, and community matters. Of these respondents, two were from Tufts, two from Ohio State, two from CSIS, and one from Harvard, indicating all four institutions could improve upon their fellowship orientation programs. Other suggestions included: larger office space for the ARNG Fellows at Tufts University, (four responses); more interest shown in the fellows' research efforts (three Ohio State fellows); computers, with printers and modems in each

fellow's office (three replies); and moving the Harvard "SONS" program to the first semester, (one response).

Question 25 asked the fellows, "what could NGB, or the ARNG Directorate, do to better support the ARNG SSC Fellowship Program?"

FINDINGS: Eight of the thirty-one respondents made no suggestions, stating the program was fine as is. However, twenty-three fellows replied, with possible improvements. These suggestions fell into three general topic areas: (1) better NGB guidance and interest in the fellows' research topics (eight responses); (2), earlier determination of SSC Fellows' follow-on assignments, and better attempts to match up follow-on assignments with the fellows' research efforts (seven responses); and (3), NGB taking more of an active interest in fellows activities and communicating more frequently with them (six responses). Many of these suggestions have merit, and will be addressed more thoroughly in Chapter 5, Conclusions and Recommendations.

PART III- GENERAL INFORMATION QUESTIONS

The third part of the survey consisted of ten general interest questions. Two questions, addressing fellowship living costs, and "networking" with the USAWC resident students, had been previously asked to all former SSC Fellows, in the 1990 USAWC SSC Fellows Alumni Survey. I was curious if the answers would come out the same when addressed solely to ARNG fellows. Other questions asked about: opening up the SSC Fellowship Program for participation by USAR officers; increasing or decreasing the number of ARNG SSC Fellowships; or asking if the ARNG SSC Fellowship program should be

expanded, to include "Specialized Fellowships."

Question 26 cited findings of the 1990 USAWC SSC Fellows Alumni Survey, concerning out-of-pocket costs. That survey had indicated one of the two "negative aspects" of the SSC Fellowship program was the high cost of living on the local economy, especially in Boston, where several Fellows had stated housing and personal costs "lost" them about \$6,000 to \$10,000 "out-of-pocket" for the year.²⁶ In my survey, Question 26 was divided into two parts. Part (A) asked, "in what city did you participate in the SSC Fellowship Program?" Part (B) then followed up, "what do you estimate was your out-of-pocket costs for your fellowship year, to cover increased costs for housing, utilities, etc.?" Responses to both parts of Question 26 are contained in Table 19.

TABLE 19 - SSC FELLOWSHIP LOCATION AND "OUT-OF-POCKET" COSTS:

Part A - Fellowship Location:

CITY:	RESPONSES:	PERCENT:
Boston (Harvard Fellows)	10	32.3%
Boston (Tufts Fellows)	11	35.5%
Washington D.C. (CSIS Fellows)	5	16.1%
Columbus, Ohio (Ohio State Fellows)	4	12.9%
Rome, Italy (NATO Def. Col. Fellow)	1	3.2%
Total:		31 100%

Part B - "Out-of-Pocket" Costs:

AMOUNT:	RESPONSES:	PERCENT:
Not Applicable	4	12.9%
None	7	22.6%
\$2,000 - \$4,000	7	22.6%
\$5,000 - \$8,000	10	32.3%
\$10,000 - \$15,000	3	9.6%
Total		31 100%

FINDINGS: Responses showed twenty-one of the thirty-one ARNG Fellows (67.8%), had attended SSC Fellowships in the Boston area. The out-of-pocket expenses varied, from: "Not Applicable" for most of the fellows at CSIS, who had previously been stationed in Washington, DC, (and didn't have to PCS for the fellowship); to "None," for seven single officers, or "geographic" bachelors (who left their families at home for the year, sharing an apartment with other student officers); to a high, of \$15,000. Of the twenty fellows reporting out-of-pocket expenses, fifteen were from the Boston area. And, of the eleven fellows who reported paying between \$6,000 to \$15,000, ten were from the Boston area. The total combined out-of-pocket expenditures for the twenty fellows was \$121,000, making the "average" out-of-pocket cost per fellow, \$6,500. Costs ran higher for fellows with large families, with monthly rents running as much as \$2,000 per month. Thus, the high out-of-pocket costs cited in the 1990 USAWC SSC Alumni Survey, also held true for the ARNG SSC Fellows.

Question 27 addressed the second problem area cited by SSC Fellows in the 1990 USAWC SSC Alumni Survey, the lack of interaction and friendships with their peers. According to the 1990 USAWC Survey results, "in an organization like the Army, socializing and networking with peers is an important aspect of career and professional life." The 1990 USAWC study indicated "isolation from the bulk of contemporaries" had been the second most frequently cited "negative" of the SSC Fellowship program.²⁷ For the ARNG SSC Fellows Survey, the question pointed out the fact

that ten ARNG officers annually attend the USAWC resident course. The question then asked, "how important do you believe this lack of interface between ARNG SSC Fellows and the AWC Resident Students (both A.C. and R.C.) is?" Responses are indicated in Table 20.

TABLE 20 - IMPORTANCE OF "NETWORKING" TO ARNG SSC FELLOWS:

ANSWER:	RESPONSE:	PERCENT:
Great importance	4	12.9%
Much importance	4	12.9%
Some importance	6	19.3%
Little importance	13	42.0%
No importance	4	12.9%
Total:		31 100%

FINDINGS: Seventeen of the thirty-one respondents (54.8%), cited "networking" as of little, or no importance, to them. This differed significantly from opinions their Active Component counterparts had expressed about the issue in the 1990 USAWC Alumni Survey. One former ARNG Harvard Fellow had this to say about networking, "the issue of networking appears to be a big concern to A.C. officers. It is their view, such networking is necessary to follow-on assignments and potential promotions. I would not share the same concerns for ARNG 'folks."

Question 28 also related to networking. Each year, the USAWC resident class consists of about 290 students. When the International Officers from allied nations, civilian government employees, and officers from other branches of the U.S. military are subtracted, the number of actual U.S. Army officers attending the resident course is about two-hundred students, to include ten USAR, and ten ARNG, resident students. With this in mind, Question

28 asked, "how many of the 180 Active Army, ten USAR, and ten ARNG resident students, did you personally know?" The responses are reflected in Table 21.

TABLE 21 - NUMBER OF USAWC RESIDENT STUDENTS KNOWN:

COMPONENT:	STUDENTS KNOWN:	NONE	1 - 5	6 - 10	11 OR MORE
Active Army		2	13	9	7
ARNG		2	14	15	N/A
USAR		14	16	1	N/A

Total possible responses: 31

FINDINGS: The responses indicated of the 180 Active Component USAWC resident students, the number personally known by the ARNG SSC Fellows ranged from zero, to twenty-eight. The total number of A.C. students known was 227, averaging out to 7.3 resident students, or 4.1% of the Active Component student body. Of the ten ARNG USAWC resident students, the ARNG SSC Fellows had known 165, which averaged out to 5.3 ARNG resident students, or 53% of the ten ARNG students. Of the ten USAR USAWC resident students, the ARNG SSC Fellows had known a total of thirty-nine, which averaged out to knowing 1.25 USAR students (12.5%), per fellow. When the number of officers known in the three Army components are tallied up, (7.3 A.C. students, 5.3 ARNG, and 1.25 USAR), the typical ARNG SSC Fellow knew about 13.85 of the 200 USAWC resident students, or less than 7% of the class. Thus, the importance of networking with the USAWC resident course students is diminished, when the typical ARNG SSC Fellow knows only about 7% of the class.

Question 29 addressed the size of the USAWC SSC Fellowship Program. Citing the number of SSC Fellows for AY-92, (forty-three,

of which nine were ARNG), and considering the 25% downsizing the U.S. Army is scheduled to go through during the 1990-95 period, and the increased reliance being supposedly placed on its' Reserve Components (due to the smaller active force), the question asked, "should participation in the ARNG SSC Fellowship Program be increased, decreased, or remain the same?" Table 22 shows the responses.

TABLE 22 - FUTURE ARNG SSC FELLOWSHIP PROGRAM PARTICIPATION:

ANSWER:	RESPONSES:	PERCENT:
Increase greatly	3	9.7%
Increase somewhat	13	42.0%
Remain the same	14	45.1%
Decrease somewhat	1	3.2%
Decrease greatly	0	0.0%
Total:		31 100%

FINDINGS: Twenty-seven fellows (87.1%), thought the program should remain the same, or increase somewhat, with only one person favoring reducing it. Several fellows mentioned the possible 25% force reduction also scheduled for the ARNG, stating, "with the projected structure cuts, maintaining the same levels of participation will actually offer more opportunities." The one person recommending program reduction stated, "the downsizing will be equal for all Army components, as a result less fellowships should be provided for all, decrease the program by 25%."

Question 30 addressed the issue of expanding the ARNG SSC Fellowship Program to include "Specialized Fellowships." To date, all ARNG SSC Fellowships have been "Strategic Fellowships," occurring at graduate schools of major universities (Harvard,

Tufts, Ohio State), or a "think tank" (Center For Strategic and International Studies). However, for the past several years, a number of Active Army officers have participated in "Specialized Fellowships." These SSC Fellows spend the academic year with other U.S. defense and governmental agencies (Atlantic Council, Foreign Service Institute [Dept. of State], Dept. of Justice, Defense Systems Management College, Central Intelligence Agency, Drug Enforcement Admin., Dept. of Health and Human Services, etc.).

In Question 30, the ARNG SSC Fellows were asked, given the Guard's current involvement with other federal agencies in the areas of drug interdiction/eradication (DEA), environmental clean-up of military training facilities (EPA), etc., "should the ARNG SSC Fellows Program be expanded, in future years, to include participation in "Specialized Fellowships?" The responses appear in Table 23.

TABLE 23 - SHOULD THE ARNG GET "SPECIALIZED" FELLOWSHIPS:

ANSWER:	RESPONSES:	PERCENT:
Strongly agree	9	29.0%
Agree	12	38.7%
Neutral	6	19.4%
Disagree	1	3.2%
Strongly disagree	3	9.7%
Total: 31		100%

FINDINGS: Twenty-one of the ARNG SSC Fellows (67.7%), responded favorably to ARNG participation in the "Specialized Fellowship" program. However, of those favoring the proposal, several stated that following the Specialized Fellowship, the ARNG officer should then be reassigned to that agency, to utilize

the special skills acquired during the fellowship year.

Question 31 carried the "Specialized Fellowship" idea further, asking, "if the ARNG SSC Fellowship Program is expanded to include "Specialized Fellowships," to which federal agencies should ARNG SSC Fellows be assigned?" The responses are shown in Table 24.

TABLE 24 - ARNG PARTICIPATION IN "SPECIALIZED FELLOWSHIPS":

ANSWER:

RESPONSES:

Shouldn't be involved in "Specialized" program	4
Neutral, or "No Comment"	4
Drug Enforcement Administration (interdiction)	21
Environmental Protection Agency	13
Department of Justice	7
Department of Transportation	7
Department of Health and Human Services	6
Central Intelligence Agency	6
Department of State	3
Federal Emergency Management Agency	2
Dept. of Education, FCC, FAA, Congress, Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ)	1 (each)

Total possible responses: 31

FINDINGS: Twenty-three of the ARNG SSC Fellows (74.2%), thought the ARNG should participate in the "Specialized Fellowship" program, and indicated the agency(s) they believed ARNG SSC Fellows should be assigned to. The most popular agencies (and reason for fellowships) were: DEA (drug interdiction and eradication); EPA, (environmental clean-up, ARNG training areas); Dept. of Justice (law enforcement, civil disturbance coordination, etc.); and Dept. of Transportation (air traffic control, inland waterways, engineering assistance on federal highway projects, etc.).

Apparently, officials at the National Guard Bureau, and the Department of the Army, already agree on the importance of the ARNG's involvement in SSC "Specialized Fellowship" Program, and

have taken action. Beginning in Academic Year 1993 (July 1992), the ARNG will have its first "Specialized SSC Fellowship," with an ARNG military police officer being assigned to train with the Drug Enforcement Administration, in Washington, D.C., for one year.

Question 32 addressed the issue of possibly expanding the USAWC SSC Fellowship Program to include participation by U.S. Army Reserve (USAR) officers. Currently, the only resident SSC quotas received by the USAR are the ten officers it annually sends to the USAWC Resident Course, at Carlisle Barracks, Pennsylvania (USAR officers can also participate in the two-year non-resident USAWC Corresponding Studies Course). The question, citing the decrease in A.C. force levels, and the increased reliance being supposedly placed on the Army's Reserve Components, asked, "should the USAWC SSC Fellowship Program be expanded, in the future, to include participation by USAR officers?" The responses appear in Table 25.

TABLE 25 - SHOULD THE USAR PARTICIPATE IN SSC FELLOWSHIPS:

ANSWER:	RESPONSES:	PERCENT:
Strongly agree	9	29.0%
Agree	11	35.5%
Neutral	8	25.8%
Disagree	1	3.2%
Strongly Disagree	2	6.5%
Total:		31 100%

FINDINGS: Twenty of the thirty-one respondents (64.5%), thought the USAR should participate. Only three ARNG fellows (9.7%), opposed USAR participation. Cautions were expressed, however, that the USAR should be allowed to have SSC Fellowships, provided they didn't decrease ARNG participation in the fellowship

program. Another fellow stated, "the Active Component participation in the (SSC) program should be reduced, with the reduction going to the USAR." And, a former Harvard ARNG fellow said, "the absence of the USAR (in the SSC Fellowship Program) was both noted and felt."

Question 33 carried the possibility of USAR participation in the SSC Fellowship Program further, asking, "if the USAWC SSC Fellowship Program is expanded to include USAR participation, in which area(s) should they participate in (Strategic, Specialized, both, neither)?" The responses are reflected in Table 26.

TABLE 26 - SSC FELLOWSHIP PARTICIPATION FOR USAR OFFICERS:

ANSWER:	RESPONSES:	PERCENT:
Strategic (campus) Fellowships only	5	16.1%
Specialized (agency) Fellowships only	1	3.2%
Both Strategic and Specialized	23	74.2%
Shouldn't be allowed to participate	2	6.5%
Total:		31 100%

FINDINGS: Twenty-nine of the respondents (93.5%), thought the USAR should be allowed into the SSC Fellowship program, with three-fourths of the fellows stating they should be permitted in both types of fellowships. Several officers cited some of the USAR's unique missions as good opportunities for fellowship program involvement. According to one former Tufts Fellow, "they (USAR Fellows), could make a big impact, combining civil affairs and fellowships."

NOTE: The U.S. Army recently addressed future options for the SSC Fellowship Program. During AY-1992, it investigated the possibility of expanding the program, to include USAR officers, by

sending its project officer to visit current SSC Fellowship institutions. A decision was recently reached, and according to the USAWC SSC Fellowship Coordinator's Office, the USA will begin participating in the "Strategic" SSC Fellowship Program during Academic Year 1994 (July 1993). Current projections call for the USAR to receive five SSC Fellowships for AY 94: two at the Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy (Tufts University); two at a new SSC Fellowship Program being established at the University of Texas-Austin; and one with Harvard University.

Question 34 dealt with issue of NGB, (or the State TAGs, for state-controlled ARNG Fellows), making follow-on assignments early in the fellowship year, stating, "NGB and/or the State TAGs should identify follow-on assignments early in (or prior to the start of) the Fellowship year, so ARNG Fellows can then "key" their research studies to a topic that will relate to their next assignments."

The SSC Fellows responses to the issue appear in Table 27.

TABLE 27 - EARLY IDENTIFICATION OF FOLLOW-ON ASSIGNMENTS:

ANSWER:	RESPONSES:	PERCENT:
Strongly agree	13	42.0%
Agree	6	19.3%
Neutral	6	19.3%
Disagree	5	16.2%
Strongly Disagree	1	3.2%
Total:		31 100%

FINDINGS: The ARNG SSC Fellows had mixed opinions about the question, with responses being recorded in all five answer categories. While the benefits of being able to relate the research effort to the SSC Fellow's follow-on assignment received

a 61.3% approval rating, those who disagreed with the proposal brought up some valid points. One former Harvard fellow said, "the fellow should not be constrained by tying follow-on assignments to research. A fellow should be given the latitude to select a topic." Another former fellow stated, "research does not need to be job-related, but should be of interest to the researcher."

Question 35 was open-ended, asking, "what was the biggest detractor" to you during your fellowship year, and how could this problem have been eliminated?"

FINDINGS: Seven fellows replied saying they had experienced "no detractors," while another three fellows chose not to comment on the issue. Of the twenty-one fellows who did comment, (67.7%), most replies fell into four major issues. These areas included: (1) concern over not knowing follow-on assignments until very late in the fellowship year, (five responses); (2) lack of a structured program at the institution, making it difficult to stay focussed and motivated, (four responses); (3) the high cost of living and out-of-pocket expenses for Boston-area fellowships (four responses); and (4), family separation, cited by three fellows who had been "geographic" bachelors.

Several other "detractors," each receiving one response, were: family relocation and housing search; isolation from the USAWC resident program students; the requirement to take Harvard's Senior Officials' National Security (SONS) Seminar in the spring (precluding freedom to pursue academic courses during the Spring Semester); and having to work on a group project, (on an agreed-

upon topic), which had compromised the individual's personal project preference.

Question 36 was another open-ended question, asking, "if you could make one major improvement to the existing ARNG SSC Fellowship Program, what would it be?"

FINDINGS: Three of the thirty-one ARNG respondents made no comments. Of the remaining twenty-eight, three major issues emerged: (1) Knowing follow-on assignments earlier, so research might be keyed to the specific area; (2) better involvement by NGB in research topics and program interest; and (3), several USAWC issues, to include greater visibility of the SSC fellows and their research efforts by the USAWC staff, being treated more like "total equals" with the USAWC resident students, and for fellowship graduates to receive the same "credentials" as the AWC graduates.

Several other good individual suggestions were made, which will be addressed in Chapter 5, Conclusions and Recommendations.

PART IV - DEMOGRAPHIC DATA

The remaining fourteen survey questions dealt with demographic information about the ARNG SSC Fellows. Among the data sought was information about: source of commission, basic branch, military and civilian education levels, previous military service, unit command experience, assignments held since completing MEL-1 certification, and years of service remaining until retirement.

Question 37 asked, "what is your current ARNG status?" The status of each survey respondents appears in Table 28.

TABLE 28 - CURRENT ARNG STATUS:

STATUS:	RESPONSES:	PERCENT:
Title 10 AGR Tour Officer	26	83.9%
Title 32 AGR Tour Officer	2	6.4%
ARNG Military Technician	0	0.0%
M-Day (Traditional) Guardsman	3	9.7%
Total:		31 100%

FINDINGS: Four former ARNG SSC Fellows did not respond to the survey, with three of the four being Title 10 AGR officers. When the survey author (also Title 10 AGR), was included, the total for all former ARNG SSC Fellows increased by five, to thirty-six, with: thirty (83.4%), being Title 10 AGR; two (5.5%), being Title 32 AGR; one (2.8%), being an ARNG Military Technician; and three (8.3%), being Traditional (Mobilization-Day) Guardsmen.

Question 38 asked the ARNG survey respondents, "what is your primary (Army) Branch of Service?" The results are indicated in Table 29, below:

TABLE 29 - BRANCHES OF ARNG SSC FELLOWS:

ARMY BRANCH:	RESPONSES:	PERCENT:
Infantry	6	19.4%
Special Forces	1	3.2%
Armor	2	6.5%
Field Artillery	5	16.1%
Engineer	6	19.4%
Aviation	5	16.1%
Military Police	1	3.2%
Military Intelligence	1	3.2%
Signal Corps	1	3.2%
Adjutant Generals Corps	2	6.5%
Medical Service Corps	1	3.2%
Total		31 100%

Question 39 asked the SSC Fellows, "what is the source of your Army commission?" The data appears in Table 30, below:

TABLE 30 - SOURCE OF ARMY COMMISSION:

PROGRAM:	RESPONSES:	PERCENT:
U.S. Military Academy	2	6.5%
Army ROTC	6	19.4%
U.S. Army (Federal) OCS	12	38.6%
ARNG (State) OCS	10	32.3%
Direct Commission	1	3.2%
Totals:	31	100%

NOTE: In contrast, the 1990 USAWC Senior Service College Fellows Alumni Survey, published September 1991, Table 12, (Page 15), revealed the Source of Commission for all responding SSC Fellows (Active Duty and ARNG). Those Sources of Commission, and their percentages were: U.S. Military Academy, 41.2%; Army ROTC, 33.8%; U.S. Army (Federal) OCS, 20.6%; and Direct Commission, 4.4%.

Question 40 asked the ARNG Fellows, "are you a combat veteran?" Those who are, were then asked to indicate the conflict in which they served. The results (thirty-one responses) are shown below, in Table 31:

TABLE 31 - ARNG COMBAT VETERANS:

CATEGORY:	RESPONSES:	PERCENT:
Combat Veteran - No	15	48.4%
Combat Veteran - Yes	16	51.6%
Total:	31	100%
COMBAT VETERANS, BY CONFLICT:	(16)	(51.6%)
Vietnam Vet (One Tour)	11	35.5%
Vietnam Vet (Two Tours)	3	9.7%
Vietnam Vet (Three Tours)	1	3.2%
Desert Shield/Desert Storm	1	3.2%

NOTE: In contrast, the percentage of Combat Veterans in both the

U.S. Army War College Resident Class, and all USAWC SSC Fellows (Active Component and ARNG) for Academic Year 1992 are as follows. USAWC Resident Students: total percent of Combat Veterans, 77%; (by conflict: Vietnam, 43%, Grenada, 1%, Panama, 7%, Desert Shield/Desert Storm, 26%). USAWC SSC Fellows: total percent of Combat Veterans, 72%; (by conflict: Vietnam, 52%, Grenada, 0%, Panama, 2%, Desert Shield/Desert Storm, 18%). Source of Information: 1992 USAWC SSC Fellowship Program Briefing Slides.

Question 41 asked the ARNG SSC Fellows to, "indicate those military education courses you have completed, and how the courses were taken."

Unlike their Active Army counterparts, who attend most Army service schools as fulltime, resident students, many of the ARNG SSC Fellows had completed Army courses by: correspondence programs (100% non-resident instruction); attendance at U.S. Army Reserve Forces (USARF), Schools (usually four weeknights per month, with two-week resident phases in the summer, all taught by USAR instructors); or by branch, Officer Advanced Course resident/non-resident courses (two-week summer resident phases, with the September-thru-May instruction being completed by either correspondence course, or attendance at USARF weekly instruction).

Abbreviations used in Table 32, Military Education Courses Completed, are: Officer Basic Course, (OBC); Officer Advanced Course, (OAC); Command and General Staff College, (C&GSC); Military Occupational Specialty, (MOS); and Secondary Skill Identifiers, (SSI). The designation "OAC #2" means the officer completed a second branch advanced course, which is sometimes required, when ARNG units are reorganized into a different branch (for example, changing from an infantry unit, into a transportation unit).

TABLE 32 - MILITARY EDUCATION COURSES COMPLETED:

STATUS:	Resident	Resident / Non. Res.	USARF School	Correspon dence
COURSE:	---	---	---	---
OBC	29*	2	0	0
OAC #1	12	13	4	2
OAC #2, if applicable	0	1	0	6
C&GSC	7**	3	16	5
Other MOS or SSI courses:				
Airborne	2			
Ranger	1			
Flt Schl	3			
ORSA	4			
DRRI/DEOMI	1 / 1			
Motor Off	3			
Air Aslt	1			

*--Includes 7 fellows who attended Basic Branch OCS & OBC combined

**--Attended the 5-month (17 week) RC-C&GSC Resident Course

Question 42 asked the ARNG SSC Fellows, "indicate the highest civilian education level you attained, when selected for attendance at the USAWC SSC Fellowship Program. The data appears in Table 33.

TABLE 33 - HIGHEST CIVILIAN EDUCATION LEVEL ATTAINED:

EDUCATION LEVEL:	RESPONSES:	PERCENT:
College Graduate	1	3.2%
Some Graduate Credit	4	12.9%
Master's Degree	22	71.0%
Doctorate/Ph.D/J.D.	4	12.9%
Total	31	100%

Question 43 asked the fellows to, "indicate your rank, and Time-in-Grade in that rank, when selected for the ARNG SSC Fellowship Program."

Those officers who had achieved more than 48 months Time-In-Grade and been boarded by the annual D.A. Reserve Components Colonel's Selection Board, and selected for promotion, were considered, for survey purposes, as Lieutenant Colonels, Promotable, LTC (P), in the rank table.

The months of Time-In-Grade, when selected for SSC Fellowship attendance, varied from a minimum of eight months, to a maximum of eighty-four months. Table 34, reflects this information.

TABLE 34 - TIME-IN-GRADE WHEN SELECTED FOR SSC FELLOWSHIP PROGRAM:

RANK:	TIME-IN-GRADE (MONTHS):	RESPONSES:	PERCENT:
LTC	1 - 11	1	3.2%
LTC	12 - 23	7	22.6%
LTC	24 - 35	5	16.1%
LTC	36 - 47	6	19.4%
LTC (P)	48 - 59	6	19.4%
LTC (P)	60 - 71	4	12.9%
LTC (P)	72 - 84	2	6.4%
Total		31	100%

Question 44 asked the ARNG SSC Fellows to, "indicate the current level of staff you work on." Since the Academic Year 1992 SSC Fellows were currently in a "school status," they were asked to indicate the staff level they had worked at just prior to reporting for their SSC Fellowship Program assignment. The information is reflected in Table 35 - Current Level of Assignment, which appears on the following page.

TABLE 35 - CURRENT LEVEL OF ASSIGNMENT:

CURRENT LEVEL OF ASSIGNMENT:	RESPONSES:	PERCENT:
Service-Level Staff (DoD, JCS, DA)	6	19.3%
Joint Staffs (NGB, State TAGs, etc.)	13	42.0%
Army MACOM (FORSCOM, TRADOC, CONUSA)	7	22.6%
Two-Star Command (Divs, COSCOM, etc.)	3	9.7%
One-Star Command (Sep Bde, ROTC Region)	1	3.2%
Colonel-Level Command (Brigade)	1	3.2%
Total	31	100%

Question 45 asked the ARNG SSC Fellows, "what is your current duty position for the unit you now serve in." (current SSC Fellows were asked to give the title of their previous duty position). Positions, by type, are indicated in Table 36, below.

TABLE 36 - DUTY POSITIONS OF FORMER ARNG SSC FELLOWS:

DUTY POSITION & LEVEL:	RESPONSES:	PERCENT:
TITLE 10 AGR TOUR OFFICERS:		
Sr. ARNG Adv., OCONUS Cmds	4	12.9%
ARNG Adv, DOD, JCS, RFPB	3	9.7%
NGB Staff, Div/Branch Chief	10	32.3%
Action Off., DA Staff	2	6.5%
Action Off., FORSCOM/TRADOC	4	12.9%
ARNG PP&T Off., Army MACOM	3	9.7%
Subtotal:	26	84%
STATE ARNG OFFICERS (TITLE 32 & M-DAY):		
TAG Staff, State Pers. Off. (T-32)	1	3.2%
TAG Staff, Chf. Tng. Off. (M-Day)	1	3.2%
TAG Staff, G-2 Intel. Off. (M-Day)	1	3.2%
State PAO & Avn. Bde. Cdr. (T-32)	1	3.2%
ARNG Sep. Bde. G-3 (M-Day)	1	3.2%
Total:	31	100%

NOTES: All respondents were LTCs during their SSC Fellowships, but ten are now Colonels. Fifteen of the twenty-six Title 10 Tour Officers (57.6%), are now assigned in the Washington, D.C. area.

Question 46 asked the SSC Fellows, "how many assignments have you had since earning your MEL-1 certification?" (current SSC Fellows were asked how many assignments they expected to have, after completing their fellowships but before their twenty-year military retirement, or Mandatory Removal Date (MRD).

Responses showed that: nineteen fellows (61.3%), had (or expect to have) one assignment; eight (25.8%), had (or expect), two assignments after MEL-1; and four (12.9%), had (or expect) three assignments after MEL-1 but before military retirement, or MRD.

Question 47, building on the information obtained in Question 46, then asked the former SSC Fellows, "how many of your post-fellowship assignments were "appropriate" for an officer with MEL-1 certification?" The findings, by category, appear in Table 37, Appropriate Assignments for MEL-1 graduates, below.

**TABLE 37 - APPROPRIATE ASSIGNMENTS FOR MEL-1 GRADUATES:
(FORMER FELLOWS ONLY)**

ASSIGNMENTS AFTER MEL-1:	APPROPRIATE / NOT APPROPRIATE:	PERCENT (APPRO.)/(NOT APPRO.):
1	16 / 3 (of 19)	84.2% (A) / 15.8% (N.A.)
2	2 / 1 (of 3)	66.7% (A) / 33.3% (N.A.)
Totals:	18 / 4 (of 22)	81.9% (A) / 18.2% (N.A.)

The current SSC Fellows were asked a similar type of question (Question 47 was the only survey question to differ somewhat in question content, between the two surveys), asking them to define what type of assignment, on what level staff, they considered appropriate for an ARNG officer with MEL-1 certification.

Of the nine current ARNG SSC Fellows for AY-92, eight were Title 10 AGR Tour Officers and one was an M-Day Guardsman.

Responses to Question 47 indicated: four Title 10 AGR Fellows thought "appropriate" follow-on assignments after completing MEL-1 would be serving on a Joint, or Service level staff (DoD, JCS, Dept. of Army); while the remaining four thought assignments at NGB, as a division, or branch chief, or as the Senior ARNG Advisor at Army Major Commands (FORSCOM, TRADOC, CONUSA, etc.) would be appropriate. The one M-Day Guard fellow considered "brigade command" to be an appropriate follow-on assignment for an M-Day MEL-1 graduate.

TABLE 38 - ARNG SSC FELLOWS' MILITARY SERVICE, BY COMPONENT:

SERVICE COMPONENT:	TOTAL RESPONSES:	PERCENT/ OFFICER:	PERCENT/ ENLISTED:	MO. OF SVC* RANGE (MO.):	MO./SVC AVERAGE:
U.S. Army (Off)	23	74.2%	-	22 - 86	50.2
U.S. Army (Enl)	14	-	45.2%	4 - 11	11.8
ARNG M-Day (Off)	29	93.5%	-	60 - 192	117.8
ARNG M-Day (Enl)	7	-	22.6%	13 - 48	40.6
ARNG T-32 AGR (O)	5	16.1%	-	31 - 126	61.8
ARNG T-32 AGR (E)	0	-	0.0%	0	0.0
ARNG T-10 AGR (O)	29	93.5%	-	72 - 156	112.9
ARNG T-10 AGR (E)	0	-	0.0%	0	0.0
USAR (Off)	13	41.9%	-	2 - 42	21.9
USAR (Enl)	0	-	0.0%	0	0.0
US Air Force (O)	0	0.0%	-	0	0.0
US Air Force (E)	2	-	6.5%	48 - 193	70.5
US Navy (Off)	0	0.0%	-	0	0.0
US Navy (Enl)	1	-	3.2%	48	48.0
U.S.M.C. (Off)	1	3.2%	-	36	36.0
U.S.M.C. (Enl)	0	-	0.0%	0	0.0

Total possible responses: 31

*--indicates range of service length in months, minimum to maximum

FINDINGS: The data indicated the majority of ARNG SSC

Fellows have had extensive military service, in several service components. The "average" ARNG SSC fellow had completed about twenty-four years of service: to include 50.2 months (4 years, 2 months) of Active Army service (74.2% had U.S. Army commissioned officer service); 117.8 months (9 years, 8 months) of ARNG M-Day commissioned service (93.5%); and 112.9 months (9 years, 4 months) commissioned officer service on the Title 10 AGR program (93.5%). Only thirteen officers (41.9%), had USAR officer service, varying from 2 to 42 months in length, and averaging 21.9 months. Enlisted service, and service in other branches of the U.S. military (Air Force, Navy, Marine Corps) was limited to only a few individuals.

Question 49 asked the ARNG SSC Fellows to, "indicate your command experience, both on active duty and in the ARNG, by type of unit and duration of command." The tallied results are indicated in Table 39 - Command Experience.

TABLE 39 - ARNG SSC FELLOWS' COMMAND EXPERIENCE:

COMPONENT / COMMAND LEVEL:		RESPONSES:	PERCENT:
U.S. Army	/ Platoon/Detachment	15	48.4%
U.S. Army	/ Company/Btry./Troop	14	45.1%
U.S. Army	/ Field Grade Commands	0	0.0%
ARNG	/ Platoon/Det. .	10	32.3%
ARNG	/ Company/Btry./Troop	22	71.0%
ARNG	/ No Co. Level Command	2	6.5%
ARNG	/ Battalion Command	3	9.7%
ARNG	/ Other Field Grade Cmds.	2	6.5%
ARNG	/ No Field Grade Commands	26	83.9%
USAR	/ Platoon/Detachment	0	0.0%
USAR	/ Company/Btry./Troop	1	3.2%
USAR	/ Field Grade Commands	0	0.0%
US Marine Corps	/ Platoon/Co. Cmd	1	3.2%
Total possible responses:		31	

NOTE: Since completing his ARNG SSC Fellowship, one officer has returned to the Title 32 AGR program, and is currently in command of an ARNG aviation brigade. No other ARNG SSC Fellows have commanded above the battalion level.

FINDINGS: The command experience data indicated that most ARNG SSC Fellows had commanded company-sized units (platoons, detachments and companys), early in their careers. The majority had commanded while serving on active duty with the U.S. Army, (the average fellow had served 4 years, 2 months on active duty), or as an M-Day ARNG officer (averaging 9 years, 8 months service as a "traditional" M-Day commissioned officer).

Since twenty-six of the ARNG SSC Fellows (83.9%), were Title 10 AGR tour officers, and had "averaged" 9 years and 4 months, on the Title 10 AGR tour program, the opportunities for battalion command had been almost non-existent. Of the three ARNG SSC Fellows who had indicated battalion command experience, all had come from M-Day assignments (twenty-six fellows, 83.9%, had indicated having no field grade-level command experience).

The National Guard Bureau does sponsor a "Title 32 Battalion Command Program," whereby several Title 10 AGR Tour officers (usually two per year), are selected by an NGB Battalion Command Selection Board to return to their respective states for a two-year NGB-funded battalion command tour. Unfortunately, not all state TAGs agree to accept the Title 10 officers back in their states, and thus refuse to offer them a battalion to command (as happened to one former Harvard ARNG SSC Fellow).

Question 50 asked the ARNG SSC Fellows, "how many years of commissioned service did you have remaining, after completing your SSC Fellowship, prior to having to retire (either through completion of twenty years of Active Federal Service [AFS], or by reaching your Mandatory Retirement Date [MRD])?" The results are shown below, in Table 40 - Years of Service Remaining After SSC Completion.

TABLE 39 - YEARS OF SERVICE REMAINING AFTER SSC COMPLETION:

YEARS REMAINING UNTIL RETIREMENT:	RESPONSES:	PERCENT:
One to Two Years	1	3.2%
Two to Three Years	1	3.2%
Three to Four Years	5	16.1%
Four to Five Years	3	9.7%
Five to Six Years	11	35.5%
Six or More Years	10	32.3%
Total:		31 100%

FINDINGS: The responses indicated that twenty-one of the the ARNG SSC Fellows (67.8%), had five or more years of commissioned service remaining until retirement, after MEL-1 completion (NGB requires a waiver, from the State TAGs, for all SSC program applicants who would have less than five years commissioned service remaining after MEL-1 completion). Considering that the majority of the SSC Fellows were Title 10 AGR tour officers (83.9%), most of these officers will have two to three AGR tours prior to retirement. As the Army objective is for MEL-1 graduates to have five years of service remaining, for utilization of SSC-gained skills and program contributions at the senior-officer level, it appears the ARNG SSC Fellows are well within the Army's SSC skill utilization "window."

Question 50 was the last survey question. While Chapter 4 has provided a very detailed analysis of all the survey data obtained, several significant findings and program recommendations were noted. These ideas and suggestions for ARNG SSC Fellowship Program improvements are addressed in Chapter 5, Conclusions and Recommendations.

CHAPTER 5

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

From the survey findings and data analysis in Chapter 4, several significant conclusions and recommendations can be drawn about the Army National Guard SSC Fellows, their training during the fellowship year, and their utilization in their post-fellowship military assignments.

CONCLUSIONS:

First, since starting ARNG participation in the USAWC SSC Fellowship Program in Academic Year 1987, the program continues as the primary means for ARNG Title 10 AGR officers to complete a resident MEL-1 program. As data in question 37 ("What is your current ARNG status?" p. 59), showed: twenty-six of the thirty-one respondents (83.9%), were currently Title 10 AGR tour officers. When the status of the four survey non-respondents (and this author) were factored in, of all thirty-six ARNG officers attending SSC Fellowships during the program's six-year history, thirty-one (86.1%), were coming from Title 10 AGR assignments when they entered the SSC Fellowship Program.

Second, there is no direct relationship between the research efforts of the ARNG SSC Fellows and their follow-on assignments. Among the thirty-one respondents, only seven (22.6%), reported any relationship between their research report and their follow-on assignments. As cited in response to survey Question 7, (p. 30), concerning their research topics, six of the seven research

projects were group efforts, dealing with Department of the Army, Department of Defense, or higher level issues. None of the assignment-related projects had addressed a purely ARNG-related issue. Also, five of the seven respondents were now serving in Pentagon assignments (DOD, JCS, DA and NGB), with the other two serving in either an allied command overseas, and an Army Major Command.

Further verification of the lack of a relationship between research projects and follow-on assignments came from my personal interviews with Title 10 AGR tour officials, at GUARDPERCEN, in January, 1992. At those interviews, tour officials admitted having had no idea what the SSC Fellows' research efforts had been about. Also, they said the research efforts had "no bearing" on the follow-on assignments they selected for the Title 10 AGR SSC Fellows.

Two other indicators showing the lack of a relationship between research efforts and follow-on assignments, were the SSC Fellows' responses to survey Questions 10 and 14. Responses to Question 10 (p. 33), which asked the fellows to indicate those organizations who received a copy of the final research report, showed that only sixteen (53.3%), had provided copies to NGB, or the appropriate ARNG Directorate.

Also, Question 14 had asked the ARNG SSC Fellows how much attention NGB, or the ARNG Directorate, had taken in reviewing the results of their research. The findings (p. 37), showed that twenty-two of the thirty fellows who had produced papers (73.4%),

had answered either: "neutral" (16.7%); "little interest" (16.7%); or "no interest" (40%); had been shown in their papers by NGB, or the ARNG Directorate.

Thus it appears, any relationship between the ARNG SSC Fellow's research effort and his follow-on assignment has been accidental. Those assignments that did show a "relationship," usually occurred when the ARNG SSC Fellow had worked on a group project, which addressed a national military issue, with his follow-on assignment then, by chance, being on a high-level staff (JCS, DoD, DA), at the Pentagon.

A third conclusion from the survey research indicated the majority of the ARNG SSC Fellows believe they are being properly utilized after receiving their MEL-1 training. Survey Questions 44, 45, 46 and 47 addressed this issue.

Question 44 asked the respondents to indicate their current level of assignment. The replies (p. 64), showed twenty-six of the thirty-one (83.9%), currently work on staffs of a three-star general (CONUSA commander), or higher. Question 45 asked the SSC Fellows to list their current duty positions, (former positions, for current SSC Fellows). The replies (p. 64), indicated all twenty-six Title 10 AGR officers are assigned (or had been, for current fellows) to a major Army command (MACOM), with fifteen currently assigned in the Washington, D.C. area. Of the five M-Day Guardsmen, their assignments included: brigade commander, brigade G-3, and key positions on the staffs of State Adjutants General (TAGs), in the fields of personnel, training and intelligence.

Also, ten of the former fellows, who were LTCs at the time of their fellowships, have already been promoted to colonel.

Question 46 asked the fellows how many assignments they had served in since obtaining their MEL-1 education, with Question 47 then asking how many of those assignments were "appropriate" for officers with MEL-1 certification. The responses (p. 66), indicated that of the twenty-two former fellows, eighteen (81.9%), considered their current assignments appropriate for MEL-1 graduates.

The nine AY-92 SSC Fellows stated their believed appropriate follow-on assignments would be serving on a joint service, or service level staff (DA, DoD, JCS), or at NGB. Although not all nine current fellows knew their assignments when they responded to the survey (February 1992), all their follow-on assignments are now known. Five of the eight Title 10 AGR officers are going to assignments at NGB, one to a CONUSA, and two to Army training installations. The ninth fellow, an M-Day Guardsman, is returning to his home state, to serve on the STARC staff.

A fourth survey conclusion was that ARNG SSC Fellows differ significantly from their Active Army SSC Fellow counterparts, concerning their military backgrounds and experience. Many of the demographic questions in the survey, (Questions 37 thru 50), sought specific information about source of commission, military and civilian education levels, and command experience for the ARNG SSC Fellows. When this information is compared, with "profile" information concerning the AY-92 USAWC SSC Active Army Fellows, and

survey findings from the 1990 USAWC SSC Fellows Alumni Survey, the differences between the ARNG and Active Army SSC Fellows become most obvious.

According to USAWC demographic information about the Active Army SSC Fellows, a "profile" of the typical Active Army SSC Fellow would read as follows: Source of Commission, either U.S. Military Academy (41.2%), or Army ROTC (33.8%), (from Table 12, 1990 Alumni Survey Findings); Average Years of Service, 22, (all Active Army time); Battalion Command or higher, 75%; Combat Veterans, 72%; and, Grade of Colonel (includes LTC Promotable), 72%, (data obtained from briefing slide, USAWC AY-92 SSC Fellowship Program - Comparison With Resident Class).

In comparison, the "profile" of the typical ARNG SSC Fellow is: Source of Commission, either U.S. Army OCS, (38.6%), or State ARNG OCS (32.3%), (with only 6.5% being USMA, and 19.4% being Army ROTC grads, from Table 3, p. 28); Average Years of Service, 23, (includes 4 years - 2 months Active Army, 9 years - 8 months ARNG M-Day service, and 9 years - 4 months ARNG Title 10 AGR service, from Question 48, pp. 66--67); Battalion Command or higher, 9.7%, (Table 39 - Command Experience, p. 67); Combat Veteran, 51.6%, (Table 31, p. 60); and Grade of Colonel, (no O-6, only LTC P), 38.7%, (Table 34, Time In Grade When Selected for SSC Fellowship Program, p. 63).

Another major difference between the Active Army and ARNG SSC Fellows concerned military education, and resident attendance at Army service schools. All of the Active Army SSC Fellows had

attended a resident Officer Advanced Course, and almost all had attended a resident Command & General Staff College course (exact data unavailable). But, for the ARNG SSC Fellows, only 38.7% had attended a resident Officer Advanced Course (61.3% completing OAC through either resident-non resident, USARF School, or correspondence programs). Also, only 22.6% of the ARNG SSC Fellows had attended a resident C&GSC Course, with 77.4% having completed C&GSC through either USARF School, correspondence course, or a combination of both programs, (data from Table 32 - Military Education Courses Completed, p. 62).

The "bottom line" is that although Active Army and ARNG SSC Fellows "appear" similar in military assignments and education, the ARNG SSC Fellows have had much fewer opportunities to: attend resident Army service schools; command at the battalion level (83.9% of the ARNG SSC Fellows had not commanded any type of unit as a field grade officer, per Table 39, Command Experience, p. 69); serve in combat; or have already been selected for promotion to Colonel. Such factors as these should also be considered by GUARDPERCEN Tour Management officials when they assign Title 10 ARNG tour officers to joint, and service-level staff assignments.

A fifth conclusion is that ARNG SSC Fellows believe the U.S. Army War College is doing a very satisfactory job of supporting the ARNG SSC Fellows, while they view NGB support to them as being poor, to non-existent.

Currently, the U.S. Army War College hosts all SSC Fellows (Active Army and ARNG), to a five-day orientation program, prior to

the start of the academic year. The orientation includes three days at Carlisle Barracks, Pennsylvania, where the fellows receive: USAWC orientation briefings; personnel and financial inprocessing; a diagnostic physical fitness examination; SSC Fellowship Program briefings and suggestions, from a panel of former SSC fellows; and several social functions, to include a luncheon with the Commandant of the Army War College. The remaining two days are spent in Washington, D.C., receiving briefings at the Pentagon, from the Army Staff (DCSOPS, DCSPER, DCSLOG, etc.), and attending a dinner, held in their honor, with the Army Chief-of-Staff.

During their fellowship year, the SSC Fellows are invited to attend: the USAWC's New York City trip (October); a resident week at Carlisle Barracks (December); and are usually invited to attend the National Security Seminar Week, at Carlisle Barracks, in June. Additionally, all SSC Fellows receive periodic "Army Update" mailings of key issues, speeches and publications, throughout the year, as well as monthly mailings from the USAWC SSC Fellowship Coordinator's Office, containing updated program guidance and recently published USAWC studies and papers.

In the survey, the ARNG SSC Fellows listed their participation in USAWC-sponsored SSC Fellowship programs and activities as follows: submitted a copy of their final research report to the USAWC SSC Fellowship Coordinator, 90%, (Question 10, p. 33); attended the various USAWC programs throughout the year (Orientation Week - 83.8%, New York City trip - 48.4%, USAWC Resident Week - 93.5%, National Security Seminar Week, 51.6%, this

data from Question 16, p. 38); had contact with the USAWC SSC Fellowship Coordinator's Office on a monthly or more frequent basis, 90.3%, (Question 21, p. 43); and rated the overall support received from the U.S. Army War College staff during their fellowship year as "Good," or better, 93.5%, (64.5% of the ARNG SSC Fellows had rated it as "Excellent," data from Question 23, p. 44).

The National Guard Bureau annually hosts a two-day ARNG SSC Orientation Program, held at the Pentagon, each May. The attendees include all ARNG officers who for the next academic year, will attend a resident war college program (usually about seventeen), plus the nine USAWC SSC Fellows. There are no "fellows-unique" briefings or activities during the NGB program.

Currently, this is the only NGB-sponsored activity for the ARNG SSC Fellows during their entire fellowship year, which then begins two months later. During the academic year, NGB provides no "updates" or informational mailings to the ARNG SSC Fellows. Also, contact between NGB and the ARNG SSC Fellows is usually dependent upon the fellow contacting NGB for advise or assistance. In the past, NGB has shown little interest in either the ARNG SSC Fellows' research topics, or their final research reports.

The survey responses concerning NGB support of the ARNG SSC Fellowship Program were as follows: submitted a copy of their final report to NGB, or the ARNG Directorate, 53.3%, (Question 10, p. 33); attended the annual NGB SSC Orientation Program 83.9%; visited NGB, or GUARDPERCEN, at least once during their fellowship year, 51.6%, (Question 16, p. 38); contact with NGB, initiated by

NGB, "seldom" 35.5%, and "never" 54.8%, (total, 90.3%); contact with NGB, initiated by ARNG SSC Fellows, "monthly" or more frequently, 58%; contact with GUARDPERCEN, "seldom" or "never," 64.5% (data for these last three responses was from Question 21, p. 43); and, support provided by NGB to the SSC Fellows, (Question 23, p. 44), "excellent" 22.6%, and "good" 48.5%.

Finally, Question 25 asked the ARNG SSC Fellows for input on how NGB and the ARNG Directorate could better support the program. The fellows responded with twenty-three suggestions, the top three categories being: better NGB guidance and interest in research topics, eight responses; earlier determination of ARNG SSC Fellows' follow-on assignments, (with better attempts made to match assignments with research efforts), seven responses; and, NGB taking a more active interest in the SSC Fellows' activities and communicating more frequently with them, six responses. These responses indicate the ARNG SSC Fellow's beliefs that NGB needs to greatly increase its' contact and interest in the ARNG SSC Fellows, their activities, and their research efforts.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Six recommendations can be made from the ARNG SSC Fellows survey responses, to improve the current SSC Fellowship Program.

First, NGB should provide a listing of ARNG-related research topics to ARNG SSC Fellows, for their consideration in selecting a research topic. The fellows' responses to Survey Questions 1, 3, and 4 indicate they strongly favor this idea. Although the ARNG

Fellows should retain the right to actually select their own research topic, since most of them have chosen to write on ARNG-related issues anyway, a list of NGB-proposed research topics could prove beneficial to both parties.

Second, NGB should encourage the ARNG SSC Fellows, especially at Harvard University, to do individual, rather than group research projects. To date, nine of the ten ARNG SSC Fellows at Harvard University have worked on group projects, with only one of the eight group projects having a direct relationship with ARNG matters. Since Active Army SSC Fellows at Harvard's Kennedy School annually outnumber the ARNG SSC Fellows, eleven to two, the chances of a group voting to do an ARNG-related project are very slim. Several former ARNG Harvard fellows expressed being "strongly encouraged" to support an A.C. related topic, or "failing to get support for my R.C. related topic." To support true academic freedom, NGB should encourage the ARNG SSC Fellows at Harvard, to do individual research efforts, on a topic of their own choosing.

Third, NGB needs to establish a research POC, or "SSC Fellows Liaison Officer," on the NGB staff, to coordinate information and research support to the SSC' Fellows concerning ARNG matters. This point was continually emphasized by the ARNG SSC Fellows in their responses to Survey Questions 15, 21, 25 and 36. Currently, unless the ARNG SSC Fellow just left an NGB assignment, or has a fellowship at CSIS, in Washington, D.C., (close to NGB), the knowledge and support available to him thru the NGB staff depends primarily upon who he knows (or doesn't know!). A single NGB SSC

Fellows POC, who could coordinate support and assistance to the fellows with the entire NGB staff, would be greatly beneficial to the ARNG SSC Fellows in the field, both in providing them information, and in lowering their frustration levels.

Fourth, Title 10 AGR Tour Management officials, at GUARDPERCEN, need to do a much better job in advising the ARNG SSC Fellows of their follow-on assignments, and in keeping in touch with them during the fellowship year. Comments to Survey Questions 15, 21, 25 and 34, indicated the SSC Fellows' frustrations at sometimes not knowing their follow-on tour assignments until late April, or May of their fellowship year. Considering the small size of the ARNG SSC Fellowship Program (currently nine fellows, eight of which were Title 10 AGR tour officers for AY-92), many survey respondents believe Tour Management should be able to project, at the start of the fellowship year, what specialty area, or headquarters, the fellow might be reassigned to. Also, earlier identification of the follow-on assignments might enable the ARNG SSC Fellow to take courses, or "key" his research efforts in preparation for his next tour assignment.

Fifth, NGB needs to continue to expand the ARNG SSC Fellowship Program in the future, especially in the "Specialized Fellowship" area, with those institutions and governmental agencies who ARNG personnel and agencies work with on a daily basis. Survey responses to Questions 29, 30 and 31, indicated the ARNG SSC Fellows see "Specialized Fellowships" with such federal agencies as DEA, EPA, Department of State, and Health and Human Services as

becoming even more important in future years.

Also, with the Army's new MEL-1 educational requirement for Reserve Component promotions to general officer, scheduled to take effect in 1996, many ARNG SSC Fellows predict increased interest and program participation in the ARNG SSC Fellowship Program by M-Day Guardsmen, as a key reason why the ARNG SSC Fellowship Program should be increased.

The sixth, and final program recommendation, dealt with expanding the USAWC SSC Fellowship Program to include participation by USAR officers. Responses to Survey Questions 32 and 33 indicated the majority of ARNG SSC Fellows (93.5% in Question 33), agreed USAR officers belong in the USAWC SSC Fellowship Program. And, with USAR officers also confronting the new MEL-1 requirement for promotion to general officer beginning in 1996, the ten USAR seats annually authorized at the USAWC Resident Course will not be adequate to meet the growing USAR SSC resident course demands in the future.

Fortunately, it appears expansion of the USAWC SSC Fellowship Program to include USAR participation is already being implemented, with the USAR scheduled to receive five SSC Fellowship positions (two at Tufts University, two at the University of Texas-Austin, and one at Harvard University), beginning in Academic Year 1994.

In summary, the conclusions and recommendations cited in this chapter, are based upon the problems, issues, and suggestions addressed by the thirty-one ARNG SSC Fellows who have completed the program and who responded to this survey. Hopefully, by learning

of the problem areas and possible solutions, cited by former program participants, actions can then be taken to further refine and improve upon the ARNG's SSC Fellowship Program.

APPENDIX 1

ARNG SSC FELLOWS BY ACADEMIC YEAR

YEAR	INSTITUTION	RANK* & NAME	STATE	STATUS
1987	Harvard	COL Roger L. Goodrich Jr.	CA	Title 10
1988	Harvard	LTC Ronald W. Krisak	NJ	Title 10
		COL Morris W. Wood	UT	Title 10
1989	Harvard	COL Philip W. Spence	PA	Title 10
		LTC Darald F. Stebner	WA	Title 10
	Ohio State	LTC Gustave W. Franke	VA	Title 10
	Tufts	LTC Douglas S. Becker	WI	Title 10
		LTC Steven L. Funk	CA	Title 10
		COL John P. Walsh Jr.	MA	Title 10
1990	CSIS**	LTC Ronald J. Lattanzi	KS	Title 10
		COL Richard P. Morton	MD	Title 10
	Harvard	COL Daniel L. Hessman	SD	Title 10
		LTC Jerry B. Warden	TX	Title 10
	Ohio State	COL Gus L. Hargett Jr.	TN	Title 10
	Tufts	COL Reid K. Beveridge	DE	M-Day
		COL James M. Burgess	IL	Mil Tech
		LTC George L. Hargrove	MO	Title 10
1991	CSIS	LTC Donald O. Bills	UT	Title 10
		COL Ronald J. Tipa	NY	Title 10
	Harvard	LTC Robert H. Cooper	TN	Title 10
		LTC Joseph R. Oliva	NJ	Title 10
	NATO D.C.***	LTC Robert E. Tripp	NC	Title 10
	Ohio State	LTC Stanley A. Murrell	TX	Title 10
	Tufts	LTC Jerry G. Davis	OK	M-Day
		COL Rodney L. Moore	NE	Title 32
		LTC Peter W. J. Onoszko	MD	Title 10
		LTC Charles A. Reimer	MA	Title 10

*--Rank indicates current grade, most were LTCs during fellowship

**--Center for Strategic and International Studies, Washington, DC

***--NATO Defense College, Rome, Italy

APPENDIX 1 - ARNG SSC FELLOWS BY ACADEMIC YEAR (Cont'd):

YEAR	INSTITUTION	RANK & NAME	STATE	STATUS
1992	CSIS	LTC Ralph S. Lund	UT	Title 10
		LTC Rayburn G. Smith	VA	Title 10
	Harvard	LTC Jon R. Beckenhauer	NE	Title 10
		LTC Cheryl A. Brown	AL	Title 10
	Ohio State	LTC Steven R. de Kramer	MI	Title 10
	Tufts	LTC Charles M. Coleman	OH	M-Day
		LTC Charles A. Doll	OH	Title 10
		LTC Clinton L. Tennill Jr.	MO	Title 10
		LTC Joseph F. Thomas	ND	Title 10

* * *

APPENDIX 2

RESEARCH REPORTS DONE BY ARNG SSC FELLOWS

NAME, INSTITUTION & YEAR, TOPIC, (GROUP OR INDIV. PROJECT):

Beckenhauer, John R., Harvard '92, R.C. / A.C. Force Structure
Into the 90's: After the Cold War (Group)

Becker, Douglas S., Tufts '89, U.S. Military Negotiators (Indiv.)

Beveridge, Reid K., Tufts '90, The Montgomery Amendment:
Implication For the Total Force (Group, w/Burgess, James M.)

Bills, Donald O., CSIS '91, (No Paper Produced)

Brown, Cheryl A., Harvard '92, The ARNG Title 10 AGR Program
(Indiv.)

Burgess, James M., Tufts '90, The Montgomery Amendment:
Implications For the Total Force (Group, w/Beveridge, Reid K.)

Coleman, Charles M., Tufts '92, Resident SSC Opportunities For
the M-Day Soldier (Indiv.)

Cooper, Robert H., Harvard '91, United States / Central American
Relations (Group)

Davis, Jerry G., Tufts '91, Telecommunication Training in the
Army National Guard (Indiv.)

de Kramer, Steven R., Ohio State '92, Compliance with National
Environmental Policy Act Ensures ARNG Readiness (Indiv.)

Doll, Charles A., Tufts '92, Strategy For Reserve Component
Training (ARNG) (Inactive Duty Training) (Indiv.)

Franke, Gustave W., Ohio State '89, Land Defense of CONUS
(Indiv.)

Funk, Steven L., Tufts, '89, The Correlation of Officer
Selection Battery Scores to ROTC Cadet Advanced Camp Performance
(Indiv.)

Goodrich, Roger L. Jr., Harvard '87, Warfighting in the Pacific
(Group)

Hargett, Gus L. Jr., Ohio State '90, Mobilization and
Deployment (Indiv.)

APPENDIX 2 - RESEARCH REPORTS DONE BY ARNG SSC FELLOWS (Cont'd):

- Hessman, Daniel L., Harvard '90, The U.S. Army in Korea: Evolving Missions and Forces for Northeast Asia (Group, w/Warden, Jerry B., and others)
- Krisak, Ronald W., Harvard '88, Humanitarian Assistance in Third World Countries (Group)
- Lattanzi, Ronald J., CSIS '90, Conventional Combat 2002 (Group, w/Morton, Richard P., and others)
- Lund, R. Scott., CSIS '92, Using Active Component Troop Leaders in Reserve Component Units: At What Level (Indiv.)
- Moore, Rodney L., Tufts '91, An Examination of the ARNG's Role in the Post Cold War Strategy (Indiv.)
- Morton, Richard P., CSIS '90, (Two Papers): Conventional Combat 2002 (Group, w/Lattanzi, Ronald J.); and The Future of the National Guard and Reserve (Group)
- Murrell, Stanley A., Ohio State '91, The Future of the Reserve Components - A Practical Solution (Indiv.)
- Olivia, Joseph R., Harvard '91, Dynamic Response: Military Strategy and Force Structure Into the 21st Century (Group)
- Onoszko, Peter W. J., Tufts '91, The Use of Horse Mounted Troops in Counter Insurgency/Low Intensity Conflict (Indiv.)
- Reimer, Charles A., Tufts '91, The Greek Crisis (Indiv.)
- Smith, Rayburn G., CSIS '92, Utilization of ARNG AGR Title 32 Officers as APMS (Indiv.)
- Spence, Philip W., Harvard '89, The Role of DoD in the War on Drugs (Group, w/Stebner, Darald R., and others)
- Stebner, Darald R., Harvard '89, The Role of DoD in the War on Drugs (Group, w/Spence, Philip W., and others)
- Tennill, Clinton L. Jr., Tufts '92, The Training and Utilization of ARNG Senior Service College Fellows, 1987 - 1992 (Indiv.)
- Thomas, Joseph F., Tufts '92, Active Component Perceptions of the ARNG Subsequent to Desert Storm (Indiv.)
- Tipa, Ronald J., CSIS '91, Nation Assistance: A Role For the Guard in Africa (Indiv.)

APPENDIX 2 - RESEARCH REPORTS DONE BY ARNG SSC FELLOWS (Cont'd):

Tripp, Robert E., NATO Defense College '91, Reserve Forces of the NATO Armies (Indiv.)

Walsh, John P. Jr., Tufts '89, Should the Army's Total Force be Maintained to Support National Security Strategy (Indiv.)

Warden, Jerry B., Harvard '90, The U.S. Army in Korea: Evolving Missions and Forces for Northeast Asia (Group, w/Hessman, Daniel L., and others)

Wood, Morris W., Harvard '88, Defense Decision Making: Is the PPBS Still Viable? (Group)

* * *

APPENDIX 3

USAWC SENIOR SERVICE COLLEGE FELLOWSHIP INSTITUTIONS FOR ACADEMIC YEAR 1992

INSTITUTION:	A.C. FELLOWS	ARNG FELLOWS
Tufts Univ. (Fletcher School - Law & Diplomacy)	1	4
Harvard Univ. (Kennedy School - Natl. Sec.)	11	2
Harvard Univ. (Center for Mideast Studies)	1	
Queens University (Kingston, Ontario)	1	
Stanford University (Hoover Institution)	1	
Atlantic Council (Washington, D.C.)	1	
Foreign Service Institute (Dept. of State)	1	
Georgetown Univ. (Walsh Schl. of Foreign Svc.)	1	
Center for Strategic & International Studies	1	2
Department of Justice	1	
Defense Systems Management College	1	
Central Intelligence Agency	1	
University of Pittsburgh (Ridgeway Center)*	1	
Drug Enforcement Agency*	1	
Joint Center for Political & Economic Studies	1	
Ohio State University (The Mershon Center)	2	1
NATO Defense College (Rome, Italy)	5	
Department of Health & Human Services	1	
Armed Forces Comm. & Electronics Association	1	
Total	34	9
Total AY-1992 USAWC SSC Fellows:	43	

*--New Program for AY-92

ARNG Senior Service College Fellows Survey

Part I - Fellowship Orientation and Research Efforts

1. The Department of the Army provides Army SSC Fellows with a list of recommended Student Research Topics, to assist them in selecting a research project. The National Guard Bureau and/or the Army National Guard Directorate should provide ARNG SSC Fellows with a list of ARNG-related topics which they would like researched.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
-------------------	-------	---------	----------	----------------------

2. The State Adjutant General (TAG) should provide research topic input for M-Day, Title 32, or Military Technician officers from his state who will be attending an ARNG fellowship.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
-------------------	-------	---------	----------	----------------------

3. Given your choice of selecting a research topic, from which area did you choose to do your research in:

- a. Active Army problem/issue
- b. National-level ARNG problem/issue
- c. State-related ARNG problem/issue
- d. Other military service issue
- e. Non-military topic
- f. Did not do a research project

4. When did you first formulate the topic that you eventually did your research on?

- a. Prior to attending the NGB SSC Orientation Program
- b. Based upon an issue presented at the NGB Orientation
- c. Prior to reporting to my SSC institution
- d. Based upon an issue/topic presented during the Army War College/DA Orientation Program
- e. After beginning my fellowship year
- f. I did not do a research project

5. What was the title of your research project?

6. Was your research project an individual effort, or was it a group project?

7. Was there any relationship between your research effort and your follow-on AGR tour(s) or ARNG troop unit assignment(s)? If so, explain the relationship.

8. Adequate TDY funding was available from NGB to cover expenses for all essential research travel.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
-------------------	-------	---------	----------	----------------------

9. With the austere defense budgets projected for the future which of the following do you think is most valid, concerning TD costs for ARNG SSC Fellow research efforts? (choose one response):

- a. Increase TDY funding if needed, to cover all essential travel
- b. Keep the current TDY funding level (about \$3,500 per fellow)
- c. Reduce TDY funding to about \$2,000 to \$2,500 per fellow
- d. Have the appropriate ARNG Directorate, or State TAG fund, if it is their research topic
- e. Seek funding support from the Host University/department
- f. Other(specify): _____

10. Which of the following organizations received a copy of your final research report? (check as many as applicable):

- ___ a. Your SSC Institution/Fellowship Advisor
- ___ b. Army War College SSC Fellowship Coordinator
- ___ c. NGB, or ARNG Staff Agency (proponent for research issue)
- ___ d. State TAG, or appropriate State ARNG staff directorate
- ___ e. Copy submitted to a military publication, or scholarly journal (if published, give date/issue and the name of the publication)

11. The National Guard Bureau's annual ARNG Senior Service College Orientation Program, held at the Pentagon, provided the essential NGB and ARNG update briefings and background materials needed to prepare me for my SSC Fellowship.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
-------------------	-------	---------	----------	----------------------

12. ARNG officers selected to attend the resident Army War College usually report to Carlisle Barracks, PA, two days prior to the NGB SSC Orientation, to receive an AWC orientation about the college, POI, housing, facilities, etc. It would greatly benefit ARNG SSC fellows if NGB set up a one-day SSC Fellows Orientation Program, to be held in Washington, D.C., just prior to the annual ARNG SSC Orientation Program.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
-------------------	-------	---------	----------	----------------------

13. If NGB were to hold a one-day SSC Fellows Orientation, to be held immediately prior to the annual NGB SSC Orientation, which of the topics below should be presented? (please rank in order of importance: 1- most important, 2- second most important, etc.):

- ___ a. Selecting A Research Topic
- ___ b. Course Selection, course load and campus activities
- ___ c. Surviving at the fellowship site (finding a house, VHA rates, nearest military medical facilities, etc.)
- ___ d. Orientation about the fellowship area (guidance about schools, cost of living, local sites and activities, special events, etc.)
- ___ e. Life as an ARNG SSC Fellow (remarks from former ARNG SSC Fellows now assigned to NGB or DA)
- ___ f. Other (specify): _____

14. How much attention did NGB, or the appropriate ARNG Directorate, or your state TAG, take in reviewing the results of your SSC Fellowship research project?

Strongly Interested	Some Interest	Neutral	Little Interest	No Interest
------------------------	------------------	---------	--------------------	----------------

15. How could NGB, the ARNG Directorate, or the State TAG (for Title 32, M-Day and Mil Tech fellows), improve upon the support provided to the ARNG SSC Fellows during the academic year?

Part II - SSC Fellowship Program and Facilities

16. During your SSC fellowship year, indicate those activities you attended:

- ☐ a. NGB annual SSC Orientation Week at the Pentagon
- ☐ b. Campus/Institution visit (prior to reporting), for house hunting, etc.
- ☐ c. USAWC/DA Orientation Week
- ☐ d. USAWC New York City Trip
- ☐ e. USAWC Resident Week
- ☐ f. USAWC National Security Seminar Week
- ☐ g. Visit to NGB/GUARDPERCEN (Title 10 Tour officers only)
- ☐ h. Visit to State TAG/State Headquarters (all SSC fellows)
- ☐ i. Attended annual NGAUS General Conference
- ☐ j. Attended State National Guard Assn Conference
- ☐ k. Other (specify): _____

17. Which of the facilities/resources listed below were available to you at your SSC Fellowship site: (check all that apply)

- ☐ a. individual desk
- ☐ b. bookcase/shelves
- ☐ c. file cabinet
- ☐ d. telephone (personal line, or shared with other fellows)
- ☐ e. computer, with printer
- ☐ f. Xerox machine
- ☐ g. POV parking (annual cost for parking sticker: _____)
- ☐ h. Research data processing/SPSS computer analysis
- ☐ i. Campus/Institution Library
- ☐ j. Attend or audit classes at other nearby colleges or institutions
- ☐ k. Gym/Field house (PT facilities)
- ☐ l. Other (specify: _____)

18. At your SSC Fellowship institution, how many courses did you take each semester (indicate "A" for audit, or "C" if the course was taken for credit):

1st Semester _____

2nd Semester _____

Other (no courses, on Quarter terms, etc.) _____

19. On average, how many hours-per-week did you spend participating in the following activities:

- _____ Class attendance
- _____ Course readings
- _____ Library/research project readings
- _____ Research prep/telephone interviews/coordination
- _____ PT/physical conditioning
- _____ Attending guest speaker lectures, luncheons or dinners
- _____ Attending departmental, or student/faculty programs
- _____ Other (specify: _____)

20. Which of the following activities did your SSC Fellowship institution make available for your participation (check all applicable):

- _____ a. Guest speaker series (military, diplomatic, scholar, etc)
- _____ b. Campus/Departmental orientation, inprocessing, tour
- _____ c. Military conference, or security studies seminar
- _____ d. Military ball or other military social activity
- _____ e. National, or international crisis simulation (wargame)
- _____ f. Field trips to local military installations, media, governmental, or social service agencies, etc
- _____ g. Extended field trip, involving military airlift, to CONUS or OCONUS military installations, foreign nations, etc.
- _____ h. Other (specify: _____)

21. How often did you have contact (face-to-face, telephonic, or by mail) with the following individuals or agencies during your fellowship period?

(Indicate response: D = Daily; W = Weekly; B = Biweekly; M = Monthly; S = Seldom; or N = Never):

- _____ a. Your professors
- _____ b. Your faculty advisor, or research supervisor
- _____ c. Director of your school, or institution
- _____ d. NGB/ARNG Directorates (initiated by them)
- _____ e. NGB/ARNG Directorates (initiated by you)
- _____ f. Your State Adjutant General (TAG)
- _____ g. Your State ARNG unit of Assignment (STARC, etc.)
- _____ h. Your previous duty assignment/replacement (calling back for information, phone number, a report, etc.)
- _____ i. Tour Management/GUARDPERCEN (Title 10 AGR officers)
- _____ j. Army War College SSC Fellowship Coordinator/or sec.
- _____ k. Other (specify): _____

22. During your Fellowship, how would you rate the support provided to you, in your research efforts, by your SSC institution?

Very Supportive	Usually Supportive	Neutral	Poorly Supported	No Support
--------------------	-----------------------	---------	---------------------	---------------

23. How would you rate the support provided to you during your SSC Fellowship by the following state, regional, or national agencies:

(Indicate response: E = Excellent; G = Good; S = Some;
P = Poorly Supported; or N = No Support)

- _____ a. Nearest military support installation
- _____ b. Army War College staff
- _____ c. National Guard Bureau agencies
- _____ d. Army Guard Personnel Center (GUARDPERCEN)
- _____ e. State TAG/State Headquarters/STARC
- _____ f. Other (specify) _____

24. What improvements could your host institution (university) have made to improve the SSC Fellowship program?

25. What could NGB, or the ARNG Directorate, do to better support the ARNG SSC Fellowship program?

Part III - General Information Questions

26. In the 1990 Army War College survey of SSC Fellows Alumni, one of the main findings was the high cost-of-living on the local economy encountered by SSC Fellows, which resulted in significant out-of-pocket expenses.

(a) In what city did you participate in the SSC Fellowship program?

(b) What do you estimate was your total "out-of-pocket" cost for your fellowship year, to cover the increased costs of housing, utilities, medical care, etc.?

27. A second concern expressed by SSC Alumni in the 1990 AWC SSC

Fellows Survey was the issue of "isolation from the bulk of contemporaries" or the inability to regularly "network" with their resident student peers. Given that 10 ARNG officers attend the Army War College Resident Course each year, how important do you believe this lack of interface between the ARNG SSC Fellows and the AWC Resident Students (both A.C. and R.C.) is?

Great Importance	Much Importance	Some Importance	Little Importance	No Importance
---------------------	--------------------	--------------------	----------------------	------------------

28. During your SSC Fellowship year:

(a) How many (estimate) of the A.C. AWC Resident students did you personally know? _____

(b) How many of the 10 ARNG AWC Resident Students did you personally know? _____

(c) How many of the 10 USAR AWC Resident Students did you personally know? _____

29. The AWC SSC Fellowship Program for Academic Year (AY) 1991-92 consists of 44 fellows, of which nine are ARNG officers. For future years, considering the downsizing of the Active Army and the growing importance that may be placed on the ARNG, should participation in the ARNG SSC Fellowship Program be increased, decreased, or remain at the same level?

Increase Greatly	Increase Somewhat	Remain The Same	Decrease Somewhat	Decrease Greatly
---------------------	----------------------	--------------------	----------------------	---------------------

Explain:

30. The AWC SSC Fellowship Program is currently divided into two general categories. The "Strategic Fellowships" are located at academic institutions (Harvard, Tufts, Ohio State, etc.). The other category, "Specialized Fellowships" are with other U.S. defense and government agencies (Departments of Justice, Health and Human Services, CIA, Drug Enforcement Agency, etc.). Given the Guard's involvement with other federal agencies in the areas of drug interdiction/eradication, environmental clean-up, etc., the ARNG SSC Fellows program should be expanded, in future years, to include participation in "Specialized Fellowships".

Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
-------------------	-------	---------	----------	----------------------

31. If you think the ARNG SSC Fellowship program should be expanded to include "Specialized Fellowships," to which federal agencies should ARNG SSC Fellows be assigned (DEA, EPA, CIA, Depts. of Justice, Health and Human Services, Transportation, etc.)? Explain.

32. The USAR is not currently included in the AWC SSC Fellowship Program. With the decrease in Active Component forces and the increasing reliance being placed on the Reserve Components, and its leaders, the AWC SSC Fellowship Program should be expanded in the future, to include participation by USAR officers.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
-------------------	-------	---------	----------	----------------------

33. If the AWC SSC Fellowship Program is expanded to include the USAR, in which area(s) of the Fellowship Program should USAR officers participate in? (Select one response):

- a. "Strategic Fellowships" (campus) only.
- b. "Specialized Fellowships" (U.S. Government agencies) only.
- c. Both the Strategic and the Specialized Fellowships.
- d. The USAR shouldn't be allowed to participate in the SSC Fellowship program.

34. Given the size of the ARNG SSC Fellowship Program, (nine for AY 1991-92), NGB and/or the State TAGS should identify follow-on assignments early in (or prior to the start of) the Fellowship year, so ARNG Fellows can then "key" their research studies to a topic that will relate to their next assignments.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
-------------------	-------	---------	----------	----------------------

35. What was the biggest "detractor" to you during your fellowship year and how could this problem have been eliminated?

36. If you could make one major improvement to the existing ARNG SSC Fellowship Program what would it be? Why?

Part IV - Demographic Information

37. What is your current ARNG status:

- a. Title 10 (federal) AGR
- b. Title 32 (state) AGR
- c. Military Technician (Federal or State)
- d. M-Day Guardsman

38. What is your Branch/Primary MOS _____/_____

39. What was your source of comission:

- a. Army ROTC
- b. Federal OCS
- c. State OCS
- d. West Point
- e. Direct Commission
- f. Other (specify: _____)

40. Are you a combat veteran?

Yes No If yes: a. Vietnam (tours) _____
b. Other (specify _____)

41. Please indicate those military education courses you have completed, and how they were taken (Resident, Resident/Non Resident, USAR School, or Correspondence):

STATUS:	Resident	Resident / Non. Res.	USAR School	Correspon- dence
COURSE:	-----	-----	-----	-----
OBC				
OAC #1				
OAC #2, if applicable				
C&GSC				
Other MOS or SSI courses: (specify)				

42. Circle your highest civilian education level when selected for to SSC course attendance:

- a. College grad (bachelor's degree)
- b. Some Graduate Credit
- c. Master's Degree
- d. Doctorate/Ph.D/J.D.
- e. Post Doctoral Study

43. Your rank and Time-In-Grade when selected for the ARNG SSC Fellowship Program (Note: If you were boarded by the DA RC Colonel's Board after four years in grade and you were "selected for promotion," for the purposes of this survey, consider yourself as a "LTC(P)"):

Rank Time-in-Grade (Months) (when selected for Fellowship):

LTC _____

LTC (P) _____

COL _____

44. Your current level of assignment:

- a. Service Staff (DOD, DA, DAF)
 - b. Joint Staff below Service level (NGB, State TAG HQs, etc.)
 - c. Army MACOM (AGR officers only): FORSCOM, TRADOC, CONUSA, Corps
 - d. Division-level (A.C. or R.C.): COSCOM; (two-star commands)
 - e. Separate Brigade (One-Star Commands)
 - f. Divisional Brigade (Colonel Command)
 - g. Battalion Command (If you command a battalion, indicate type, and duration of command, ex: armor bn, 2 yrs):
-

45. What is your current duty position for the unit you now serve in: (specify if you're an M-Day Guardsman or AGR)

46. Since earning your MEL-1 certification, how many assignments have you had?

- a. One b. Two c. Three d. Four or more

47. Of these assignments, how many were "appropriate" for an ARNG officer with MEL-1 certification?

- a. None b. One c. Two d. Three or More

48. List all of your military service to present, (Enlisted and Commissioned), by months of service:

MONTHS OF SERVICE:

COMPONENT:

Enlisted:

Commissioned:

Active Army

ARNG (M-Day)

ARNG (Title 32 AGR)

ARNG (Title 10 AGR)

USAR

Other Branches: _____

49. List the types of units, and months of command, for those organizations which you have commanded - (put the Army component: AUS, ARNG, USAR, or other military service branch, in parenthesis):

a. Company-Level Commands (example: platoon, company, troop, battery, detachment, etc.):

- 1 _____
- 2 _____
- 3 _____
- 4 _____

b. Field-Grade Commands (any O-4 rank or higher level command, example: Avn Co, battalion, cav squadron, etc):

- 1 _____
- 2 _____
- 3 _____

50. How many years of commissioned service did you have remaining, after completion of your SSC Fellowship, prior to retiring from the service:

- a. 1 - 2 years
- b. 3 - 4 years
- c. 5 - 6 years
- d. More than 6 years remaining

Thank you very much for your time and cooperation in completing this ARNG SSC Fellows Program survey. If there are any additional aspects of the ARNG SSC Fellowship Program you would like to address, please make them below (attach additional sheets, if you need more space for comments). Please mail your completed survey to:

LTC Clint Tennill Jr.
4 Woodmoor Drive
Bedford, MA 01730

Home Phone: (617) 275-6196

ARNG Senior Service College Fellows Survey
(AY 1991-92 ARNG SSC Fellows)

Part I - Fellowship Orientation and Research Efforts

1. The Department of the Army provides Army SSC Fellows with a list of recommended Student Research Topics, to assist them in selecting a research project. The National Guard Bureau and/or the Army National Guard Directorate should provide ARNG SSC Fellows with a list of ARNG-related topics which they would like researched.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
-------------------	-------	---------	----------	----------------------

2. The State Adjutant General (TAG) should provide research topic input for M-Day, Title 32, or Military Technician officers from his state who will be attending an ARNG SSC Fellowship.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
-------------------	-------	---------	----------	----------------------

3. Given your choice of selecting a research topic, from which area did you choose to do your research in:

- a. Active Army problem/issue
- b. National-level ARNG problem/issue
- c. State-related ARNG problem/issue
- d. Other military service issue
- e. Non-military topic
- f. Did not do a research project

4. When did you first formulate the topic that you are doing your research on?

- a. Prior to attending the NGB SSC Orientation Program
- b. Based upon an issue presented at the NGB Orientation
- c. Prior to reporting to my SSC institution
- d. Based upon an issue/topic presented during the Army War College/DA Orientation Program
- e. After beginning my fellowship year
- f. I did not do a research project.

5. What is the title of your research project?

6. Is your research project an individual effort, or is it a group project?

7. If you already know your follow-on (post-SSC Fellowship) ARNG assignment, does there appear to be any relationship between your fellowship research effort and your follow-on AGR tour, or ARNG troop unit assignment? If so, explain the relationship.

8. Adequate TDY funding is available from NGB to cover expenses for all my essential research travel.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
-------------------	-------	---------	----------	----------------------

9. With the austere defense budgets projected for the future, which of the following do you think is most valid, concerning TDY costs for ARNG SSC Fellow research efforts: (choose one response)

- a. Increase TDY funding if needed, to cover all essential travel.
- b. Keep the current TDY funding level (about \$3,500 per fellow).
- c. Reduce TDY funding to about \$2,000 to \$2,500 per fellow.
- d. Have the appropriate ARNG Directorate, or State TAG fund, if it is their research topic.
- e. Seek funding support from the Host University/department.
- f. Other(specify): _____

10. Which of the following organizations do you plan on sending a copy of your final research report. (check as many as apply):

- ___ a. Your SSC Institution/Fellowship Advisor
- ___ b. Army War College SSC Fellowship Coordinator
- ___ c. NGB, or ARNG Staff Agency (proponent for research issue)
- ___ d. State TAG, or appropriate State ARNG staff directorate
- ___ e. Copy to be submitted to a military publication, or scholarly journal (give the name of those publication(s) you intend on sending a copy of your research findings)

11. The National Guard Bureau's annual ARNG Senior Service College Orientation Program, held at the Pentagon. provided the essential NGB and ARNG update briefings and background materials needed to prepare me for my SSC Fellowship.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
-------------------	-------	---------	----------	----------------------

12. ARNG officers selected to attend the resident Army War College usually report to Carlisle Barracks, PA., two days prior to the NGB SSC Orientation, to receive an AWC orientation about the college, POI, housing, facilities, etc. It would greatly benefit ARNG SSC fellows if NGB set up a one-day SSC Fellows Orientation Program, in Washington, D.C., just prior to the annual ARNG SSC Orientation Program.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
-------------------	-------	---------	----------	----------------------

13. If NGB were to hold a one-day SSC Fellows Orientation, to be held immediately prior to the annual NGB SSC Orientation, which of the topics below should be presented (please rank in order of importance: 1- most important, 2- second most important, etc.):

- ___ a. Selecting A Research Topic
- ___ b. Course Selection, course load and campus activities
- ___ c. Surviving at the fellowship site (finding a house, VHA rates, nearest military medical facilities, etc.)
- ___ d. Orientation about the fellowship area (guidance about schools, cost of living, local sites and activities, special events, etc.)
- ___ e. Life as an ARNG SSC Fellow (remarks from former ARNG SSC Fellows assigned to NGB or DA)
- ___ f. Other (specify): _____

14. How much interest has NGB, or the appropriate ARNG Directorate, or your state TAG, taken in being able to review the results of your SSC Fellowship research project?

Strongly Interested	Some Interest	Neutral	Little Interest	No Interest
------------------------	------------------	---------	--------------------	----------------

15. How could NGB, the ARNG Directorate, or the State TAG (for Title 32, M-Day and Mil Tech fellows), improve upon the support provided to the ARNG SSC Fellows during the academic year?

Part II - SSC Fellowship Program and Facilities

16. During your SSC fellowship year, indicate those activities which you have attended, or plan to attend:

- ☐ a. NGB annual SSC Orientation at the Pentagon
- ☐ b. Campus/Institution visit (prior to reporting) for house hunting, etc.
- ☐ c. USAWC/DA Orientation Week
- ☐ d. USAWC New York City Trip
- ☐ e. USAWC Resident Week
- ☐ f. USAWC National Security Seminar Week (held in June)
- ☐ g. Visit to NGB/GUARDPERCEN (Title 10 Tour officers only)
- ☐ h. Visit to State TAG/State Headquarters (all SSC fellows)
- ☐ i. Attended NGAUS Conference (held in Hawaii, in Sept 91)
- ☐ j. To attend 1992 State National Guard Assn. Conference
- ☐ k. Other (specify): _____

17. Which of the facilities/resources listed below are available to you at your SSC Fellowship site: (check all that apply)

- ☐ a. individual desk
- ☐ b. bookcase/shelves
- ☐ c. file cabinet
- ☐ d. telephone (personal line, or shared with other fellows)
- ☐ e. computer, with printer
- ☐ f. Xerox machine
- ☐ g. POV parking (annual cost for parking sticker: _____)
- ☐ h. Research data processing/SPSS computer analysis
- ☐ i. Campus/Institution Library
- ☐ j. Able to attend or audit classes at other nearby colleges or institutions
- ☐ k. Gym/Field house (PT facilities)
- ☐ l. Other (specify: _____)

18. At your SSC Fellowship institution, how many courses have you taken (or are currently enrolled in) for each semester (indicate "A" for audit, or "C" if the courses were/are being taken for credit):

1st Semester _____

2nd Semester _____

Other (no courses, on Quarter terms, etc.) _____

19. On average, how many hours-per-week are you spending in participating in the following activities:

- _____ Class attendance
- _____ Course readings
- _____ Library/research project readings
- _____ Research prep/telephone interviews/coordination
- _____ PT/physical conditioning
- _____ Attending guest speaker lectures, luncheons or dinners
- _____ Attending departmental, or student/faculty programs
- _____ Other (specify:_____)

20. Which of the following activities does your SSC Fellowship institution make available for your participation (check all applicable):

- _____ a. Guest speaker series (military, diplomatic, scholar, etc)
- _____ b. Campus/Departmental orientation, inprocessing, tour
- _____ c. Military conference, or security studies seminar
- _____ d. Military ball or other military social activity
- _____ e. National, or international crisis simulation (wargame)
- _____ f. Field trips to local military installations, media, governmental, or social service agencies, etc.
- _____ g. Extended field trip, involving military airlift, to CONUS or OCONUS military installations, foreign nations, etc.
- _____ h. Other (specify:_____)

21. How often do you have contact (face-to-face, telephonic, or by mail) with the following individuals or agencies during your fellowship tour?

(Indicate response: D = Daily; W = Weekly; B = Biweekly; M = Monthly; S = Seldom; or N = Never):

- _____ a. Your professors
- _____ b. Your faculty advisor, or research supervisor
- _____ c. Dean of your school, or the college
- _____ d. NGB/ARNG Directorates (initiated by them)
- _____ e. NGB/ARNG Directorates (initiated by you)
- _____ f. Your State Adjutant General (TAG)
- _____ g. Your State ARNG unit of Assignment (STARC, etc.)
- _____ h. Your previous duty assignment/replacement (calling back for information, phone number, a report, etc.)
- _____ i. Tour Management/GUARDPERCEN (Title 10 AGR officers)
- _____ j. Army War College SSC Fellowship Coordinator/or sec.
- _____ k. Other (specify:_____)

22. During your Fellowship, how would you rate the support being provided to you, in your research efforts, by your SSC institution?

Very Supportive	Usually Supportive	Neutral	Poorly Supported	No Support
--------------------	-----------------------	---------	---------------------	---------------

23. How would you rate the support being provided to you during your SSC Fellowship year by the following regional, or national agencies:

(Indicate response: E = Excellent; G = Good; S = Some;
P = Poorly Supported; or N = No Support)

- _____ a. Nearest military support installation
- _____ b. Army War College staff
- _____ c. National Guard Bureau agencies
- _____ d. Army Guard Personnel Center (GUARDPERCEN)
- _____ e. State TAG/State Headquarters/STARC
- _____ f. Other (specify) _____

24. What improvements could your host institution (university) make to improve their support of the SSC Fellowship program?

25. What do you think NGB, or the ARNG Directorate, could do to better support the ARNG SSC Fellowship program?

Part III - General Information Questions

26. In the 1990 Army War College survey of SSC Fellows Alumni, one of the main findings was the high cost-of-living on the local economy encountered by SSC fellows, which resulted in significant out-of-pocket expenses.

(a) In what city are you participating in the SSC Fellowship program?

(b) What do you estimate will be your total "out-of-pocket" costs for your fellowship year, to cover the increased costs of housing, utilities, medical care, etc., that you are encountering?

27. A second concern expressed by SSC Alumni in the 1990 AWC SSC Fellows Survey was the issue of "isolation from the bulk of contemporaries" or the inability to regularly "network" with their resident student peers. Given that 10 ARNG officers attend the Army War College Resident Course each year, how important do you believe this lack of interface between the ARNG SSC Fellows and the AWC Resident Students (both A.C. and R.C.) is?

Great Importance	Much Importance	Some Importance	Little Importance	No Importance
---------------------	--------------------	--------------------	----------------------	------------------

28. During this SSC Fellowship year:

(a) How many (estimate) of the A.C. AWC Resident students do you personally know? _____

(b) How many of the 10 ARNG AWC Resident Students do you personally know? _____

(c) How many of the 10 USAR AWC Resident Students do you personally know? _____

29. The AWC SSC Fellowship Program for Academic Year (AY) 1991-92 consists of 44 fellows, of which nine are ARNG officers. For future years, considering the downsizing of the Active Army and the growing importance that may be placed on the ARNG, should participation in the ARNG SSC Fellowship Program be increased, decreased, or remain at the same level?

Increase Greatly	Increase Somewhat	Remain The Same	Decrease Somewhat	Decrease Greatly
---------------------	----------------------	--------------------	----------------------	---------------------

Explain:

30. The AWC SSC Fellowship Program is currently divided into two general categories. The "Strategic Fellowships" are located at academic institutions (Harvard, Tufts, Ohio State, CSIS, etc.). The other category, "Specialized Fellowships" are with other U.S. defense and government agencies (Departments of Justice, Health and Human Services, CIA, Drug Enforcement Agency, etc.). Given the Guard's involvement with other federal agencies in the areas of drug interdiction/eradication, environmental clean-up, etc., the ARNG SSC Fellows program should be expanded, in future years, to include participation in "Specialized Fellowships".

Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
-------------------	-------	---------	----------	----------------------

31. If you think the ARNG SSC Fellowship program should be expanded to include "Specialized Fellowships," to which federal agencies should ARNG SSC Fellows be assigned (DEA, EPA, CIA, Depts. of Justice, Health and Human Services, Transportation, etc.)? Explain.

32. The USAR is not currently included in the AWC SSC Fellowship Program. With the decrease in Active Component forces and the increasing reliance being placed on the Reserve Components, and its leaders, the AWC SSC Fellowship Program should be expanded in the future, to include participation by USAR officers.

Strongly	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly
Agree				Disagree

33. If the AWC SSC Fellowship Program is expanded to include the USAR, in which area(s) of the Fellowship Program should USAR officers participate in: (Select one response)

- a. "Strategic Fellowships" (campus) only.
- b. "Specialized Fellowships" (U.S. Government agencies) only.
- c. Both the Strategic and the Specialized Fellowships.
- d. The USAR shouldn't be allowed to participate in the SSC Fellowship program.

34. Given the size of the ARNG SSC Fellowship Program, (nine for AY '91-92), NGB and/or the State TAGS should identify follow-on assignments early in (or prior to the start of) the Fellowship year, so ARNG Fellows can then "key" their research studies to a topic that will relate to their next assignments.

Strongly	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly
Agree				Disagree

35. What has been the biggest "detractor" to you during your fellowship year and how could this problem have been reduced, or eliminated?

36. If you could make one major improvement to the existing ARNG SSC Fellowship Program what would it be? Why?

Part IV - Demographic Information

37. What is your current ARNG status:

- a. Title 10 (Federal) AGR
- b. Title 32 (State) AGR
- c. Military Technician (Federal or State)
- d. M-Day Guardsman

38. What is your Branch/Primary MOS _____/_____

39. What was your source of comission:

- a. Army ROTC
- b. Federal OCS
- c. State OCS
- d. West Point
- e. Direct Commission
- f. Other (specify: _____)

40. Are you a combat veteran?

Yes No If yes: a. Vietnam(tours) _____
b. Other(specify _____)

41. Please indicate those military education courses you have completed, and how they were taken (Resident, Resident/Non Resident, USAR School, or Correspondence):

STATUS:	Resident	Resident / Non. Res.	USAR School	Correspon- dence
COURSE:	-----	-----	-----	-----
OBC				
OAC #1				
OAC #2, if applicable				
C&GSC				
Other MOS or SSI courses: (specify)				

42. Circle your highest civilian education level when selected for to SSC course attendance:

- a. College grad (bachelor's degree)
- b. Some Graduate Credit
- c. Master's Degree
- d. Doctorate/Ph.D/J.D.
- e. Post Doctoral Study

43. Your rank and Time-In-Grade when selected for the ARNG SSC Fellowship Program (Note: If you were boarded by the DA RC Colonel's Board after four years in grade and you were "selected for promotion," for the purposes of this survey, consider yourself as a "LTC(P)"):

Rank Time-in-Grade (Months) (when selected for Fellowship):

LTC _____

LTC (P) _____

COL _____

44. Your previous level of assignment, prior to starting your

fellowship year:

- a. Service Staff (DOD, DA, DAF)
- b. Joint Staff below Service level (NGB, State TAG HQs, etc.)
- c. Army MACOM (AGR officers only): FORSCOM, TRADOC, CONUSA, Corps, etc.
- d. Division-level (A.C. or R.C.), COSCOM (two-star commands)
- e. Separate Brigade (Brig Gen-level Commands)
- f. Divisional Brigade (Colonel-level Commands)
- g. Battalion Command (If you commanded a battalion, indicate type, and duration of command, example: armor bn, 2 yrs):

45. What was the title of your previous duty position, before beginning your SSC Fellowship? (specify if you were an M-Day Guardsman or Title 10, or Title 32, AGR Tour Officer):

46. After earning your MEL-1 certification, how many assignments do you expect to have, before you retire from the military?

- a. One b. Two c. Three d. Four or more

47. What type of assignment, on what level staff, would you consider to be appropriate for an ARNG officer with a MEL-1 certification?

48. List all of your military service to present, (Enlisted and Commissioned), by months of service:

MONTHS OF SERVICE:

<u>COMPONENT:</u>	<u>Enlisted:</u>	<u>Commissioned:</u>
Active Army	_____	_____
ARNG (M-Day)	_____	_____
ARNG (Title 32 AGR)	_____	_____
ARNG (Title 10 AGR)	_____	_____
USAR	_____	_____
Other Branches: _____	_____	_____

49. List the types of units, and months of command, for those

organizations which you have commanded - (put the Army component: AUS, ARNG, USAR, or other military service branch, in parenthesis):

a. Company-Level Commands (platoon, company, troop, battery, detachment, etc.):

- 1 _____
- 2 _____
- 3 _____
- 4 _____

b. Field-Grade Commands (any O-4 rank or higher level command, example: Avn Co, battalion, cav squadron, etc):

- 1 _____
- 2 _____
- 3 _____

50. How many years of commissioned service will you have remaining after completion of your SSC Fellowship, prior to retiring from the service:

- a. 1 - 2 years
- b. 3 - 4 years
- c. 5 - 6 years
- d. More than 6 years remaining

Thank you very much for your time and cooperation in completing this ARNG SSC Fellows Program survey. If there are any additional aspects of the ARNG SSC Fellowship Program you would like to address, please make them below (attach additional sheets, if you need more space for comments). Please mail your completed survey to:

LTC Clint Tennill Jr.
4 Woodmoor Drive
Bedford, MA 01730

Home Phone: (617) 275-6196

ENDNOTES

1. A Brief Narrative, Information For Guests, The U.S. Army War College, Carlisle Barracks, Pa, undated, p. 8.

2. Ibid., p. 3.

3. Ibid., p. 8.

4. Ibid., p.4.

5. Ibid., p. 12.

6. Ibid., p. 12.

7. Glenda Y. Nogami, Julie Colestock, Terry A. Phoenix and COL Robert C. White Jr., USA, U.S. Army Senior Service College Fellows Alumni Survey - 1990, September 1991, U.S. Army War College, Carlisle Barracks, PA, p. 2.

8. Senior Service College Fellowship Program, Directive, Academic Year 1992, U.S. Army War College, Carlisle Barracks, Pennsylvania, p. A1.

9. U.S. Army Senior Service College Fellows Alumni Survey - 1990, U.S. Army War College, Carlisle Barracks, Pennsylvania, p. 1.

10. Ibid., p.1.

11. Ibid.

12. Ibid., p. 13.

13. Ibid., p. 13.

14. Ibid., p. 2.

15. Ibid., p. 7.

16. Ibid., p. 3.

17. Letter from Colonel Roger L. Goodrich Jr., concerning the USAWC SSC Fellowship Program, dated 19 February 1992.

ENDNOTES

18. Listing of ARNG SSC Fellows, by Academic year, provided by Mr. Harry Gilman, NGB-ARO-E (Education Branch), Edgewood Arsenal, Maryland, in October 1991.

19. Ibid.

20. NGB-ARO-E Memorandum, SUBJECT: 1993 ARNG Senior Service College Selectees, dated September 16, 1991.

21. NGB-GO-AR Memorandum, All States Log No. I92-0113, SUBJECT: MEL-1 Requirement for Promotion to General Officer Grade, dated March 6, 1992.

22. Information Paper, from National Guard Bureau General Management Office (NGB-GO-AR), SUBJECT: RC MEL-1 Task Force Update, dated April 24, 1992, received from MAJ Vermeer, NGB-GO-AR.

23. U.S. Army Senior Service College Fellows Alumni Survey - 1990, U.S. Army War College, Carlisle Barracks, Pennsylvania, p. 7.

24. Ibid., p. 9.

25. Ibid., p. 12.

26. USAWC Senior Service College Fellows Alumni Survey - 1990, U.S. Army War College, Carlisle Barracks, Pennsylvania, September 1991, p. 29.

27. Ibid., p. 29.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- National Guard Bureau, NGB-ARO Letter, SUBJECT: Change of FY 91 Senior Service College (SSC) Application Suspense Cycle, Washington, DC, 1 February 1990.
- National Guard Bureau, NGB-ARO-E Letter, SUBJECT: ARNG Senior Service College Selectees, Class of 1992, Washington, DC, 17 August 1990.
- National Guard Bureau, NGB-ARO-E Letter, SUBJECT: Senior Service College Applications, Class of 1993, Washington, DC, 14 February 1991.
- National Guard Bureau, NGB-ARO-E Letter, SUBJECT: ARNG Senior Service College Selectees, Class of 1993, Washington, DC, 16 September 1991.
- National Guard Bureau, NGB-ARO-ME Letter, SUBJECT: Senior Service College Applications, Class of 1994, Washington, DC, 3 January 1992.
- National Guard Bureau, NGB-GO-AR Letter, SUBJECT: MEL-1 Requirement for Promotion to General Officer Grade, Washington, DC, 6 March 1992.
- National Guard Bureau, NGB-ARP-C Letter, SUBJECT: Senior Service College Selection Procedures, Washington, DC, 14 April 1992.
- National Guard Bureau, NGB-GO Information Paper, SUBJECT: RC MEL-1 Task Force Update, Washington, DC, 24 April 1992.
- National Guard Bureau, National Guard Regulation 351-21, Senior Service Colleges Colleges, Washington, DC, 30 April 1983.
- U.S. Army War College, A Brief Narrative, Information For Guests, Carlisle Barracks, PA, 1990.
- U.S. Army War College, Senior Service College Fellows Biographical Sketches, 1992, Carlisle Barracks, PA, 20 July 1991.
- U.S. Army War College, Military Studies Program, Academic Year 1992, Carlisle Barracks, PA, Undated.
- U.S. Army War College, Senior Service College Fellows Alumni Survey - 1990, Carlisle Barracks, PA, September 1991.
- U.S. Army War College, Senior Service College Fellowship Program, Directive, Academic Year 1992, Carlisle Barracks, PA, Undated.

BIBLIOGRAPHY (cont't):

- U.S. Army War College, Senior Service College Fellowship Program, Administrative Handbook, Academic Year 1992, Carlisle Barracks, PA, Undated.
- U.S. Army War College, Academic Year 1989 Assigned SSC Fellows Research Topics/Projects, Carlisle Barracks, PA, Undated.
- U.S. Army War College, Academic Year 1990 SSCFP Research Papers, Carlisle Barracks, PA, 15 August 1990.
- U.S. Army War College, Academic Year 1991 SSCFP Research Papers, Carlisle Barracks, PA, 29 August 1991.
- U.S. Army War College, Academic Year 1992 SSC Fellows Research Topics, Carlisle Barracks, PA, 4 December 1991.
- U.S. Army War College, Academic Year 1992 Command Brief (Paper Copy of Briefing Slides), Carlisle Barracks, PA, Undated.
- U.S. Army War College, Survey of USAWC Graduates, From Academic Years 1983 - 1990, Carlisle Barracks, PA, March, 1990.

* * *