



2

1992
Executive Research Project
S14

The Army Adjutant General's Corps Regiment--Where Are We Headed and Who's in Charge?

Colonel
Michael G. Carkhuff
U. S. Army

Faculty Research Advisor
Colonel Richard N. Strand, USA



The Industrial College of the Armed Forces
National Defense University
Fort McNair, Washington, D.C. 20319-6000

~~DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT~~
Approved for public release
Distribution Unlimited

98 3 31 013

93-06575



Unclassified

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE

1a. REPORT SECURITY CLASSIFICATION Unclassified			1b. RESTRICTIVE MARKINGS		
2a. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION AUTHORITY N/A			3. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY OF REPORT Distribution Statement A: Approved for public release; distribution is unlimited.		
2b. DECLASSIFICATION/DOWNGRADING SCHEDULE N/A			5. MONITORING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER(S) Same		
4. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER(S) NDU-ICAF-92- <i>D14</i>			7a. NAME OF MONITORING ORGANIZATION National Defense University		
6a. NAME OF PERFORMING ORGANIZATION Industrial College of the Armed Forces		6b. OFFICE SYMBOL (if applicable) ICAF-FAP		7b. ADDRESS (City, State, and ZIP Code) Fort Lesley J. McNair Washington, D.C. 20319-6000	
6c. ADDRESS (City, State, and ZIP Code) Fort Lesley J. McNair Washington, D.C. 20319-6000		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) <i>The Army Adjutant General's Corps Regiment -- Where are we headed and who's in charge?</i>					
12. PERSONAL AUTHOR(S) <i>Michael J. Carlsheff</i>					
13a. TYPE OF REPORT Research		13b. TIME COVERED FROM <i>Aug 91</i> TO <i>Apr 92</i>		14. DATE OF REPORT (Year, Month, Day) April 92	
15. PAGE COUNT <i>51</i>					
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) SEE ATTACHED					
20. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY OF ABSTRACT ☒ UNCLASSIFIED/UNLIMITED ☐ SAME AS RPT. ☐ DTIC USERS			21. ABSTRACT SECURITY CLASSIFICATION Unclassified		
22a. NAME OF RESPONSIBLE INDIVIDUAL Judy Clark			22b. TELEPHONE (Include Area Code) (202) 475-1889		22c. OFFICE SYMBOL ICAF-FAP

THE INDUSTRIAL COLLEGE OF THE ARMED FORCES

RESEARCH STUDIES REPORT ABSTRACT

TITLE: The Army Adjutant General's Corps - Where are we going
and who's in charge?

AUTHOR: Michael G. Carkhuff, Colonel, USA

DATE: April 1992

This report discusses future challenges for The Army Adjutant General's Corps in personnel policy development and implementation. Two kinds of future policy development are discussed: Personnel Service Support (PSS) proponency policy, and Total Army personnel management policy.

The issue is, where are we going with future Army Personnel Policy, and who will be the leader in that important effort? The paper reviews personnel doctrine and policy areas and makes specific recommendations.

1992
Executive Research Project
S14

The Army Adjutant General's Corps Regiment--Where Are We Headed and Who's in Charge?

DTIC QUALITY INSURANCE

Colonel
Michael G. Carkhuff
U. S. Army

Faculty Research Advisor
Colonel Richard N. Strand, USA



The Industrial College of the Armed Forces
National Defense University
Fort McNair, Washington, D.C. 20319-6000

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

DISCLAIMER

This research report represents the views of the author and does not necessarily reflect the official opinion of the Industrial College of the Armed Forces, the National Defense University, or the Department of Defense.

This document is the property of the United States Government and is not to be reproduced in whole or in part for distribution outside the federal executive branch without permission of the Director of Research and Publications, Industrial College of the Armed Forces, Fort Lesley J. McNair, Washington, D.C. 20319-6000.

THE INDUSTRIAL COLLEGE OF THE ARMED FORCES

RESEARCH STUDIES REPORT ABSTRACT

TITLE: The Army Adjutant General's Corps - Where are we going and who's in charge?

AUTHOR: Michael G. Carkhuff, Colonel, USA

DATE: April 1992

This report discusses future challenges for The Army Adjutant General's Corps in personnel policy development and implementation. Two kinds of future policy development are discussed: Personnel Service Support (PSS) proponency policy, and Total Army personnel management policy.

The issue is, where are we going with future Army Personnel Policy, and who will be the leader in that important effort? The paper reviews personnel doctrine and policy areas and makes specific recommendations.

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH

Colonel Michael G. Carkhuff, USA, (MBA, Mississippi College, BS, University of Nebraska, Omaha) developed his interest in personnel service support policy management while serving in multiple command and staff assignments from battalion level to Headquarters, Department of the Army. He also served in personnel support activities during two Viet Nam assignments (1967-68 and 1972-73).

He developed an intense interest in Adjutant General's Corps proponentry while serving in staff and faculty duties at the US Army Adjutant General's School (1968-69). Following assignments as Installation Personnel Management Officer (1970-72) and Recruiting Battalion Adjutant (1973-76), he became heavily involved in Division/Installation-level personnel policy formulation and execution as Personnel Officer, HQ, 25th Infantry Division (1976-78).

Colonel Carkhuff gained an appreciation for personnel policy making from the headquarters perspective in his duties as a personnel management planner at HQ, USA Military Personnel Center (1979-82), and assignment to the Organization of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Pentagon (1982-85). He then commanded the 43d Adjutant General Battalion (1985-87), and the San Francisco Recruiting Battalion (1987-88), where he gained true insight into the importance of ensuring that Adjutant General's Corps Officers get opportunities to implement personnel policies in the field. He also saw the Total Army personnel policy perspective as Chief, Strength Management Division, HQ Sixth US Army (1988-91).

Colonel Carkhuff is a graduate of the Infantry Officer Candidate School, the Adjutant General Officer Advanced Course, the Armed Forces Staff College and the Industrial College of the Armed Forces, Class of 1992.

Table of Contents

CHAPTER	PAGE
DISCLAIMER.....	ii
ABSTRACT.....	iii
BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH.....	iv
1. INTRODUCTION.....	2
2. THE ADJUTANT GENERAL'S CORPS PROPONENCY.....	8
3. CSS REGIMENTAL PROPONENCY POLICY.....	14
4. ARMY PERSONNEL POLICY - A BROADER VIEW.....	19
CONCLUSION.....	22
APPENDICES A - E.....	23
NOTES.....	28
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	30

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

The Army Adjutant General's Corps - Where are we going and who's in charge? The principal thesis of this paper is that The Adjutant General's Corps must provide the Army's leading edge technology to ensure quality Personnel Service Support (PSS) doctrine development, and Total Army personnel management policy planning for the dramatic changes we face in the future. That visionary planning must be properly orchestrated from the departmental level to enable commanders and their adjutants general at all echelons to execute the plans effectively.

This paper is a study of how the Army can gain even more value from The Adjutant General's Corps' future contributions. I will highlight specific recommendations throughout the paper. Let's first review how our senior leadership has defined the guidance for future planning.

Setting The Stage -- A New Era Ahead

The President and his national security staff have reshaped our National Security Strategy. We have moved beyond the containment of communism toward a new defense strategy that "...shift[s] the focus of defense planning from countering the global challenge posed by the Soviet Union to responding to threats in major regions...."¹

"The National Military Strategy (NMS) guides the military

component of the National Security Strategy of the United States and is designed to attain specific objectives. The most important objective remains to deter or defeat aggression against the United States and its allies."²

"The essential foundations of the NMS are strategic deterrence and defense, forward presence, crisis response, and reconstitution. These foundations of our NMS are supported by commitments to project decisive force to ensure victory in the event of conflict, maintain our technological superiority, maintain a high degree of readiness to respond to regional contingencies, and to work within multilateral arrangements and institutions whenever possible."³

The Army leadership has developed a sound plan to restructure the force based upon four enabling strategies:

"* The first strategy is to Maintain the Edge in warfighting that we demonstrated in Panama and the Persian Gulf by balancing **quality soldiers** who have been **trained to razor sharpness**, outfitted with the **most modern equipment**, led by **tough and competent leaders**, structured in an **appropriate mix of forces** by component and type, and employed according to an **effective warfighting doctrine**.

* The second enabling strategy is to Reshape the Force to accommodate the new environment. The key here is that the reshaping effort must accommodate simultaneously the new National Military Strategy and significant resource reductions. We will be **revising doctrine** to reflect our shift to a primarily CONUS based contingency force and will be the catalyst for adjusting our training, modernization and force design. **Structuring the Force** requires that by 1995 the Army will be reduced to 4 Corps and 20 divisions (12 AC + 8 RC). **Shaping the Support Structure** requires considerable effort to reshape the Army's Combat Support and Combat Service Support structure.

* The third enabling strategy is to Provide Resources for the Force more efficiently....We will sustain soldier and family quality of life programs... We are committed to accomplishing the reshaping of our force using sound management principles to gain **Management Efficiencies**. The Army continues **Implementation of the Defense Management Review**. Four management themes define the

process: consolidate where it makes sense, reduce overhead, reorient the support base toward business practices, and restructure the Army logistics systems for the future.

* The fourth enabling strategy is to Strengthen the Total Force through our efforts to retain balance in the force as we reduce active and reserve units and end ~~strengths~~. FY92-95 Force Structure Actions will cause the Active Army to go to its lowest levels since before World War II and the Reserve Components to about the level of 1979-80."

Our leaders state clearly that our Army will be undergoing numerous dramatic changes over the next several years. The future Army faces years of dramatic turbulence as a result of the changing world. Supporting and implementing these changes will demand the very best of personnel policy planning, and most effective execution of those policies, to ensure that we maintain combat readiness and take care of soldiers throughout the transition and into the future.

Defining The Scope

I have restricted the area of this study to a manageable set of related topics concerning Army personnel doctrine and policy.

This paper will start with the subject of Army Personnel Service Support (PSS) Proponency development. We will begin that section with specific focus on the Adjutant General's Regiment. I will discuss their past and present contributions to PSS, and make some recommendations for their future role in personnel doctrine development.

The next step will be a brief look at all the Combat Service

Support (CSS) branch proponency operations. I will review how each is resourced to manage their respective personnel proponency. Then, I will make some specific recommendations about CSS proponency management.

The last part of this paper will be a look at the future of Total Army Personnel Management Policy development. That will also contain several recommendations.

This is a good place to explain how this package will fit together. We'll start with some basic information to level the playing field for all readers.

The United States Army is comprised of numerous categories of organizations that operate at various echelons of the Total Force. Those organizations are manned and equipped to perform their missions in combat and in peacetime. The people in the units are trained (individually and collectively) in skills appropriate to their unit's mission. Functional soldier skills are divided between Combat Arms (CA), Combat Support Arms (CS), or Combat Service Support (CSS). The Adjutant General's Corps is one of five distinct branches of the Combat Service Support.

To help focus on one of the CSS family, let's first review all the members of that family. They are: Adjutant General (AG); Finance (FI); Ordnance (OD); Quartermaster (QM); and Transportation (TC).⁵ Within the Army parlance, these categories are names for a specific "corps," "branch," or "regiment."

During the decade of the 1980s, the Army adopted the Regimental System. Army units became affiliated with specific

branch-oriented regiments. Army soldiers have also been able to affiliate themselves with a regiment. Regimental affiliations are based upon a soldier's prior assignment(s) to or skill/specialty association with a particular regiment, such as Infantry, Ordnance, or Adjutant General. I will frequently use the terms **regiment, branch, or corps** (interchangeably) to refer to any particular member of the CSS family. This paper will review certain aspects of all the CSS branches, and will focus specifically on the AG Corps role in personnel doctrine and policy development.

CHAPTER 2

THE ADJUTANT GENERAL'S CORPS PROPONENCY

We will start off this AG-oriented chapter with a discussion about how the AG Corps has served the Army throughout our Republic's history. We must understand the Regiment's proud history in order to develop reasonable recommendations about the future role of the Adjutant General's Corps.

Regimental History

The position of the Adjutant dates back to Roman times. The Roman "ADJUTARE" was a key advisor who assisted the commander in battle. Since those ancient times, commanders throughout history have relied and depended on their adjutants to dispatch and carry out their orders.

On June 16, 1775, the Continental Congress decreed that there be an Adjutant General in the Continental Army, similar to such positions in the French and British Armies of that day. Congress appointed Horatio Gates, a former British Army Major, as the first Adjutant General on June 17, 1775, and commissioned him in the grade of Brigadier General. General Gates was the second officer to receive a commission in the Continental Army; George Washington was the first. General Gates proved himself to be an able assistant to General Washington as well as a brilliant field commander. Following his strategic victory over the British at Saratoga on October 17, 1777, the Congress awarded General Gates our country's highest honor, the Congressional Gold Medal.

During the War of 1812, Adjutants General proved themselves to be officers of exceptional character, judgment, and combat prowess. Among these heroes were: Winfield Scott at the Battle of Fort George, Pendleton Gaines for his defense of Fort Erie, Alexander Macomb for repulsing the British in the Battle of Plattsburg, and the famous explorer, Zebulon Pike, killed in battle while leading the victorious assault on York, Canada.

Adjutants General became the only officers vested with the authority to speak for the commander. Recognizing this, the Army began appointing West Point graduates almost exclusively as Adjutants General from 1838 through the early 1900's. The first two graduates so appointed, Samuel Cooper and Lorenzo Thomas, served with distinction as Adjutants General during the Civil War. Cooper served the South, and Thomas served the North.

The distinguished history of significant accomplishments by Adjutants General has continued throughout numerous periods of peacetime and conflict throughout the 20th Century. The AG Regiment provided quality command, staff, soldier, and family support during minor and major conflicts, including WWI, WWII, Korea, Vietnam, and Desert Shield/Storm. Our Adjutant General's troops around the world played key roles that enabled this nation to wrap up the Cold War with a victory for Democracy.

For more than 200 years the mission of the Adjutant General's Regiment has remained constant and clear: to assist the commander in war and peace, and be the vanguard of personnel service support to the Army. Today, through unflagging dedication of quality

soldiers, the Regiment continues to develop new and better means of providing quality personnel service support to Army units, soldiers, and families for now and into the future. The AG Regimental motto is "Defend and Serve."⁶

AG Proponency Recommendations

Having reviewed that brief historical summary, we can now look at the Army today and as projected for the future. We must seize the initiative to ensure continuity of effective PSS doctrine planning for a dynamic future. This will be a very turbulent time for PSS planners. The Finance Corps is going "purple" as it transitions to operate under the DoD Finance and Accounting Service. Those changes combine with the painful reality of large numbers of experienced senior planners leaving the force, voluntarily or involuntarily, over the next few years. That situation means we must do the most demanding PSS doctrine planning under extremely turbulent conditions. This is really a great opportunity and presents a challenge suitable to the Army's AGs!

Maintain strong proponency leadership. The AG School Commandant is the Proponent and Chief of the Corps. To be sure, that officer directs the future doctrine of the Adjutant General's Corps. That clearly answers the question I posed at the start, "... Who's in charge?" The Army has relied on AGs to develop and manage effective Personnel Service Support (PSS) doctrine, personnel policies, and procedures since 1775. Proponency planning must recognize that requirement, ensuring that AGs will be

effectively used at every echelon, from HQDA to division and installation, developing and implementing officer and enlisted policies, procedures, and systems. "Adjutant General officers (Functional Area 42) are the best qualified planners for developing and operating Army officer and enlisted personnel management and systems policy. The AG Proponent must push to ensure more AGs are assigned to fill the important personnel policy development positions in the Officer and Enlisted Divisions of HQDA Deputy Chief of Staff, Personnel (DCSPER)."⁷ That same type of change is necessary in Field Operating Agencies and at MACOM level.

The rate and complexity of change occurring throughout the Army over the next ten years will demand the very best of technical policy planning. That complex task will be most efficiently and effectively done by the Army's professional personnelists - AGs.

Improve Total Army Proponency for AGs. We learned during Desert Shield/Storm that we have some more work to do to ensure that our USAR AG units are equipped and trained to be ready for deployment and employment in PSS roles. AG Proponency planners must ensure that the required manpower, equipment, and training are programmed for PSS missions, such as postal service, to ensure proper support to soldiers and commanders. ". . .the demands placed on the civil sector and DoD in handling the volume of mail associated with (Desert Shield/Desert Storm) far exceeded anything ever planned for in the past. . ."⁸

Pay close attention to Morale, Welfare, and Recreation (MWR) activities. The MWR resources will undergo quite a change during

the next five years as we transition to a CONUS-based Army. "Most CONUS installations have civilian employees performing MWR support activities. AG Proponency planners must ensure that the Army can deploy mission capable units (active or reserve) to provide MWR mission support to the theater commander."

Increase Staffing in the Proponency Office. The manpower summary for CSS proponency offices (page 14) clearly indicates that the AG proponent office is understaffed for the mission, especially when compared to FI and TC proponency offices. I strongly recommend that CASCOM and TRADOC ensure that each of the proponency offices be equitably staffed to perform the mission. The Army must place strong emphasis on the importance of proponency roles in doctrine development throughout these transition years to prepare the future force.

Wave The Regimental Flag. This recommendation applies to all the Army's Regiments, and especially the AG Regiment. First, there are as many regiments as there are branches of the Army. However, since CSS Branches are heavily invested in the Army's installation and non-divisional support structure, some have had difficulty adapting to regimental affiliations. That is quite understandable, since some of the CSS Branches had to really dig into their archives to develop appropriate regimental unit affiliations. Now we can take advantage of the transition to CONUS-basing to make the CSS Regiments as important to the Army as the Chief of Staff intended them to be. The Adjutant General's Regiment is the Army's oldest. AG Proponency planners should take advantage of that

position and develop something of a Public Affairs Plan to "market" upcoming PSS changes. AGs can and should work to ensure proponent policy changes are announced and implemented with a positive spin in every case.

Conduct annual AG Regimental Conferences. "The AG School Commandant (Proponent) should host a AG Branch/Regimental Conference each year. This will be invaluable to AGs worldwide to ensure progressive doctrine planning and support for DA policy/procedure development. The Army has a right to expect the best of PSS doctrine from its AGs. That doctrine is best when it is developed in coordination with and stands the scrutiny of AGs in the field. Remember to invite key AGs in the USAR business too."¹⁰

Make the AG proponent a general officer. As the Army shrinks in the next several years, I believe that the proponents will become much more involved and influential in the personnel doctrine and policy development business. "The Army will be better served by ensuring that each of the branch proponent organizations is headed by a general officer. In the case of AG, (like others in the CSS family) that general officer should also be the Commandant of the AG School."¹¹ That should occur when the AG School relocates to Fort Jackson, SC upon Ft Benjamin Harrison's closure, scheduled in 1994. "The Commanding General, USA Soldier Support Center, should remain an "AG" general officer, even after the command transfers to Fort Jackson, SC."¹²

Emphasize tactical proficiency. "AGs must continue to remain tactically proficient in every assignment. AG personnel who

deployed with Just Cause and Desert Shield/Desert Storm were extremely successful both technically and tactically."¹³ Our formal and informal training and professional development must continue to stress the importance and value of maintaining soldier and leader skills.

These AG proponency recommendations will help provide the Army's leading edge technology to ensure coordinated PSS doctrine planning for the dramatic changes in the future. Now let's expand our vision to include the entire CSS family of branches.

CHAPTER 3

CSS REGIMENTAL PROPONENCY POLICY

The US Army Training and Doctrine Command (TRADOC) is the Major Command (MACOM) responsible to the Army Chief of Staff for, among many other missions, integrating proponency policy planning across all the Army's Regiments. One of the TRADOC Deputy Commanding Generals also commands the Combined Arms Support Command (CASCOM) and Fort Lee, Virginia. CASCOM is the Integrating Headquarters for proponency policy across all the CSS Regiments.¹⁴ While CASCOM is the integrating agency for CSS proponency, each regiment's proponent is responsible for developing their own solutions to proponency issues. There are many similarities in resources, organization and command & control among the CSS regimental proponents. There are also some differences worth discussing. (More detailed information found in Appendices A - E shows a common frame of reference for all CSS Proponency offices.)

We'll first look at a summary of the CSS regiments, then follow up with some recommendations about proponency policy.

COMBAT SERVICE SUPPORT PROPONENCY SUMMARY

Manpower Requirements:	AG	FI	OD	QM	TC
COL Chief			1		
LTC Chief	1	1	0	1	1
Staff officers, CWO - MAJ	6	7	3	4	6
Staff NCOs, SSG - SGM	6	9	4	8	4
Civilian analysts, GS11-GM13	2	0	2	4	3
Secretary/support personnel	1	0	3	1	4
Totals	16	17	13	18	18
Population Served (000)	125	9*	168	167	65

Operating Processes:

Annual General Officer Conference	X		X	X	X
Annual Regimental Conference (COL, LTC, CSM, MACOM, DA/DOD reps.)	X	X	X	X	
Semi-annual policy conference	X	X			
Semi-annual senior enlisted conference					X
Frequent EMAIL, DA messages, and Professional bulletin/magazine	X	X	X	X	X

* Finance Corps civilian requirements are not included because their proponency is managed by the office of the Comptroller of the Army.

INTEGRATING CSS PROPONENCY POLICY

The USACASCOM at Ft Lee is only a few years old, is commanded by a Lieutenant General, and has the important mission of integrating proponency issues across the Combat Service Support Branches. As an example, one of CASCOM's subordinate commands, The Army Logistics Management Center (ALMC) at Ft Lee, has been working on logistics community proponency initiatives that will help support the Army in transition, based on the force that will exist after 1995.

The coordinated planning at Ft Lee makes ALMC seem like the Army's Mecca of multi-functionality. ALMC is integrating the doctrinal issues for many of the future peacetime and wartime requirements of QM, OD, TC, and some medical service activities. The Draft version of a revised DA Pamphlet 600-3 (Commissioned Officer Professional Development and Utilization) is being developed now for publication in 1992. That process will be helpful as a training mechanism to assist the CASCOM planners (and the proponents) to integrate the entire family of CSS Proponents. However, there are some additional recommendations I'll highlight for CSS proponency planning to become truly integrated and effective.

Establish a charter for each integrating headquarters. In 1990, the TRADOC Commander established the two new proponency integration organizations. The one at Ft Leavenworth, KS is responsible for integrating proponency for Combat Arms and Combat Support Arms. The one at Ft Lee has the Combat Service Support

family. Neither new headquarters has a charter for their operations.¹⁵ Broad policy guidance for the Integrating Centers is contained in Chapter 2, AR 600-3. I strongly recommend that they each work out their own respective charter, fully coordinate the document, and obtain the TRADOC Commander's approval as soon as possible. My experience has been that when there is an absence of guidance, the best thing to do is to develop guidance that makes sense, coordinate that recommended policy, and take the results to the decisionmaker for approval. Waiting around for guidance is not usually helpful. Further, operating in a policy vacuum wastes resources. This is a time for coordinated proponenty planning to conserve resources.

CASCOM should host annual CSS Proponenty Integration Conferences, beginning in FY 93. There is a need for the CSS Proponents to closely coordinate their planning activities during the next several years. This is particularly valuable in these early years of the Integrating Centers' new role.¹⁶ The table on page 14 indicates that the differences among the CSS Proponents in operating processes and manpower requirements alone provide fertile ground for sharing good ideas. The goal should be to get all the proponents operating most efficiently and effectively. Also, the Army is going through the most significant change period since the end of WWII. None of the people on active duty now have experienced change like we face now. Those factors make a very strong case for getting the key planners together at least once a year to actually integrate CSS proponenty policy.

DA and TRADOC should host a proponency integration conference. DA and TRADOC have a great opportunity now to make use of the new TRADOC Integrating organizations to ensure coordinated doctrine development. There is an obvious need for TRADOC Headquarters to hold a proponency update conference annually, including the best and brightest from CA, CSA, and CSS Proponency planners, as well as the Army Staff Principal Coordination Points of Contact (POC). There have been attempts at this in the past. Coordinating and integrating Total Army doctrine development will be crucial throughout this upcoming period of turbulence throughout the Total Army. As cited earlier, the Army Chief of Staff has clearly directed that coordinated doctrine development is crucial to success in the future.

Increase the use of Video-Teleconferencing. It is vital for all those who plan conferences to take advantage of video-teleconferencing and teleconferencing facilities. There are enough facilities available at major installations to preclude frequent, expensive TDY travel. We need to get used to conserving all our resources. That will be necessary at every echelon from HQDA to Proponency Offices, and at installations.

We have looked at some ideas in this section for improving proponency policy planning in the CSS family and the other branch proponents. Let's expand our view again to look at future Army Personnel Management Policy.

CHAPTER 4

ARMY PERSONNEL POLICY - A BROADER VIEW

Let's transition now from the subject of proponentry doctrine development to the next topic - future Army personnel management policy development. There are many policies that will require unusually close, rapid and continuous coordination between the DA Deputy Chief of Staff for Personnel (DCSPER), Total Army Personnel Command (PERSCOM), and Army Reserve Personnel Center (ARPERCEN). I want to discuss several issues and highlight some appropriate recommendations.

This is the section of the paper that gives us an opportunity to really stretch our minds. We must build on our history and recent experience (good & bad). Personnel planners must develop and adopt improved technologies to manage a dramatically smaller Army force that will be primarily CONUS based. All our policy planning must protect each commander's ability to maintain unit readiness and take care of the individual soldier.

CONUS-basing causes significant policy review/change. The Army forces on active duty beyond 1995 will no longer be forward based. The troops are coming home. "Current projections show a shift to roughly 80% in CONUS and only about 20% overseas. Those ratios may be even worse when all the cuts are decided. That kind of change requires that we develop personnel management policies, procedures, and supporting systems based on a potential average CONUS assignment duration of about six years."¹⁷ That change

requires visionary policy review of everything from accessions to transition (cradle to grave).

Officer procurement/training policies should shift away from dollar incentives. The officer procurement policies need a completely new look. Active duty requirements shrink so dramatically that the entire Reserve Officer Training Corps (ROTC) infrastructure demands review. This is a good time to begin increasing the number of Active Guard and Reserve (AGR) cadre in the Senior ROTC program. Due to the dramatically reduced number of Active Army and Active (drilling) Reserve officers required each year, there may not be a future requirement for ROTC Scholarships. The Officer Candidate School (OCS) program may have to become even smaller - possibly training only Reserve Component candidates. The traditional USAR and NG Officer Academies and USAR Forces Schools will require review to reduce unnecessary structure and other costs. We must ensure that we only access the officers we can afford to have in the active force and drilling reserve. Training for Inactive Reservists may become very rare.

Enlisted accessions should get much cheaper. All of DoD will require fewer enlisted personnel. Reduced opportunities in the other Services, while the market of military availables remains about constant, means increased supply of applicants with less Army demand for them. Properly managed, recruiting production should cost less on a per recruit basis. The Army should take a new look at enlistment incentives to only retain those incentives that get the best return on investment.

Total Army commitment requires more commissioned officers being assigned to the Reserve Components to enhance readiness. "Unit training in the reserves needs maximum team support from the entire Army. Doing that will require more officers in the Active Army structure for Full Time Manning assignments in reserve units. The Army will have to make a conscious decision - with guidance to commanders and promotion boards - to ensure that the personnel selected for reserve component duty will remain competitive with their peers when considered for promotion and schooling."¹⁸

Sustainment policies such as promotion and schooling must be reviewed to ensure they don't drive up PCS expenses. Army promotion and professional development education and training policies require complete review. Can the Army continue the Centralized Selection Process for enlisted promotion and schooling when soldiers will be expected (by Congress) to remain at their CONUS installation for six years or more? We will need new policies or very persuasive arguments to Congress for exception-case PCS money. "We should expect increasing officer professional development requirements due to joint duty, acquisition corps, command, schooling, and reserve component assignments."¹⁹

Retention policies must be tailored and tightened. The current policies for officer and enlisted retention will require major revision. Enlistment/reenlistment periods, incentives, and qualification criteria must all be reviewed to reduce costs. There may be new ways to manage officer retention to cut the costs of training, PCS and schooling.

The transition policies must adapt to new constraints. Within the new environment, officer and enlisted separation/retirement rules will need complete review to further cut costs. Some of the current temporary procedures being used to pare down the force by 1995 may be needed on a more permanent basis. The Army's significantly smaller size will demand even more finite management by skill and by grade for officers and enlisted personnel.

Combine the PERSCOM and ARPERCEN organizations operationally. The Army must find a way to enable the Active and Reserve personnel management systems to operate together. That is a very tall order, but we must find a way to give this more than lip service. We lose much efficiency and effectiveness under the existing separate systems. The Army can save considerable annual expense by finding a means to operate PERSCOM and ARPERCEN together, either physically or via enhanced automation and communication systems.

Streamline, tailor, and simplify the automation infrastructure that will support new personnel management policies. As policies change and procedures are developed, we must adopt a strategy of tailoring and simplifying implementing automation systems, and increase pressure to reduce developmental costs in time and dollars. This automation support system challenge is very significant. The new personnel policies for the downsized Army must be ready to go by 1994/1995 (at the latest). That means we have barely two years to design, develop, and implement new personnel management policies and supporting automation systems. That is really significant!

CONCLUSION

This paper has answered the questions posed in the topic sentence and expanded in the thesis statement. We are headed into a future of challenging changes for the Army and its requirements for personnel proponenty doctrine and personnel management policy. The Adjutant General's Corps Proponent is clearly in charge of the future AG Personnel Service Support doctrine development.

The Adjutant General's Regiment is the one the Army has looked to in the past to develop, implement, and manage personnel management policies and their implementing systems. Now is the time for The Deputy Chief of Staff for Personnel to engage more of the vast experience of the Army's AGs to develop and implement personnel management policies that will help us transition to the future force.

The AGs must accept these challenges to ensure that our Army continues to enjoy the very best quality personnel management support into the future.

I'll wrap this up with a reminder to all those who will be involved in this personnel doctrine and policy development process. Let us all remember to develop policies that protect each commander's ability to maintain unit readiness, and take care of the individual soldier.

APPENDIX A - ADJUTANT GENERAL'S CORPS PROPONENCY

Proponency Mission: Performs proponency functions for the AG Branch. Provides proponency related or professional development for AG School courses and other schools as required. Develops doctrine per AR 12-6. Provides proponency and develops training for AG military and civilian specialties. Reviews training programs, including MTP & ARTEP.²⁰

Organization: DCG, TRADOC & CG, CASCOM, FT LEE, VA

CG, USA SOLDIER SUPPORT CENTER & FT BENJAMIN HARRISON, IN

CMDT, USA AGS & PROPONENT, AG REGIMENT

ADJUTANT GENERAL PROPONENCY OFFICE

Manpower Requirements:

Proponency Office Chief, LTC	1
Staff officers, CWO - MAJ	6
Staff NCOs, SSG - MSG	6
Civilian analysts, GS12	2
Secretary, GS5	1
Total required	16

Operating Processes:

1. Annual world-wide Regimental Conference (COL & LTC Cdrs, G1/AgS, MACOM reps, Reserve Component, and recent retirees develop/present proponency issues requiring policy decision.)
2. Semi-annual MILPER Council of Colonels (policy review.)
3. Semi-annual MILPER General Officer Steering Committee (AC & RC Gos decide issues to pursue with MACOM/DA.)
4. Frequent EMAIL, DA messages, and quarterly "The 1775."²¹

APPENDIX B - FINANCE CORPS PROPONENCY

Proponency Mission: Develop Finance doctrine. Develop Branch and personnel proponency for the Finance Corps per AR 5-22, Army Proponency System, and AR 600-3, Personnel Proponency System. Develop collective and individual training guidance for the Branch. Coordinate doctrine and proponency issues with Army staff, MACOMs, and Defense Finance & Accounting Service.²²

Organization:

DCG, TRADOC & CG, CASCOM, FT LEE, VA
CG, USA SOLDIER SUPPORT CENTER & FT BENJAMIN HARRISON, IN
CMDT, USAFIS & PROPONENT, FI REGIMENT
FINANCE PROPONENCY OFFICE

Manpower Requirements:

Proponency Office Chief, LTC	1
Staff Officers, CWO - MAJ	7
Staff NCOs, SSG - SGM	9
Civilian staff	<u>0</u>
Total required	17

Operating Processes:

1. Semi-annual Finance Board (COL-level Cdrs and CSMs, prior Cdrs, MACOM COLs, DoD F&AO, OCAR and Reserve Cdrs.)
2. Frequent EMAIL, DA messages, and quarterly "Diamond Points" Magazine.²³

APPENDIX C - ORDNANCE CORPS PROPONENCY

Proponency Mission: Executive agency for Chief of Ordnance, developing Ordnance personnel proponency and distributing policy to the field. Manage the Army Personnel Proponency program for the Ordnance Corps. Represent the Ordnance Corps with the Army Staff, PERSCOM, Reserve Components, and the USA Personnel Integration Command (USAPIC). Manage Ordnance programs for ROTC support. Assist in managing Ordnance officer accessions. Maintain close liaison with other Proponency Offices.²⁴

Organization:

DCG, TRADOC & CG, CASCOM, FT LEE, VA

CMDT, USA ORDNANCE CENTER & SCHOOL, CHIEF OF ORDNANCE, APG, MD

ORDNANCE PROPONENCY OFFICE

Manpower Requirements:

Proponency Office Chief, LTC	1
Staff Officers, CWO - MAJ	3
Staff NCOs, SSG - SGM	4
Civilian Analysts, GS11 - 13	2
Civilian Administrative Support	3
Total required	13

Operating Processes:

1. Annual OD Week conference in May (General Officer briefings.)
2. Annual update for retired Ordnance General Officers.
3. Frequent EMAIL, DA messages, and quarterly "Ordnance Bulletin."²⁵

APPENDIX D - QUARtermaster CORPS PROPONENCY

Proponency Mission: Develops Quartermaster Branch Proponency. Manages Quartermaster Branch operational concepts, activities concerned with Quartermaster force development, and combat developments. Manages QM collective and individual training and related training developments. Manages proponency for military and civilian personnel supporting QM missions. Branch history and personnel safety proponent.²⁶

Organization:

DCG, TRADOC & CG, CASCOM, FT LEE, VA

CG, USA QM CENTER & SCHOOL, QUARtermaster GENERAL, FT LEE, VA

QUARtermaster PROPONENCY OFFICE

Manpower Requirements:

Proponency Office Chief, COL	1
Staff officers, CWO - MAJ	4
Staff NCOs, SGT - SGM	8
Civilian Analysts, GS11 - GM13	4
Secretary, GS5	<u>1</u>
Total required	18

Operating Processes:

1. Annual COL & LTC update conference.
2. Annual General Officer Conference (active and retired General Officers).
3. Semi-annual senior enlisted update conference.
4. Frequent EMAIL, DA messages, and semi-annual Professional Development Bulletin.²⁷

APPENDIX E - TRANSPORTATION CORPS PROPONENCY

Proponency Mission: Manage Transportation Corps Personnel proponency. Gather and evaluate information, identify and prioritize issues, formulate alternatives, coordinate actions pertaining to all military and civilian personnel in the Total Army Transportation Corps. Maintain an overview of the world wide fielding of TC systems & organizations; provide recommendations to the Chief of Transportation and to the Army Staff to improve the Transportation Corps.²⁸

Organization:

DCG, TRADOC & CG, CASCOM, FT LEE, VA

CHIEF OF TRANSPORTATION, CMDT, USA TC CENTER, & FT EUSTIS, VA

DIRECTOR, OFFICE OF CHIEF OF TRANSPORTATION

Manpower Requirements:

Proponency Office Director, LTC	1
Staff officers, MWO - MAJ	6
Staff NCOs, SFC - SGM	4
Civilian analysts, GS11-13	3
Civilian support staff	<u>4</u>
Total Required	18

Operating Processes:

1. Annual General Officer symposium (active and reserve component general officers.)
2. Frequent EMAIL, DA messages, and publish quarterly professional journal.

END NOTES

1. Dick Cheney, Secretary of Defense, Annual Report to the President and the Congress, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402, January 1991, p.v.
2. Statement by General Gordon R. Sullivan, Chief of Staff, Army, before the Committee on Armed Services, United States House of Representatives, 26 February 1992.
3. Ibid.
4. Ibid.
5. Department of the Army, Personnel Proponency System, Army Regulation 600-3: 1989.
6. US Army Adjutant General's Corps Regimental Association History, Fort Benjamin Harrison, Indiana, 13 July 1988.
7. Interview with COL James C. (Bud) Kelly, Chief, Soldier Support Center Liaison Office, USA PERSCOM, Alexandria, VA, 14 February 1992.
8. Patricia Insley Hutzler, Federal Emergency Management Agency, High Value/Low Visability - Civil Agency Support for Desert Shield and Desert Storm, Logistics Management Institute, 6400 Goldsboro Road, Bethesda MD, March 1992, p.4-1.
9. Interview with LTC Bob Murphy, Chief, AG Branch, Officer Personnel Directorate, DA PERSCOM, Alexandria, VA, 14 February 1992.
10. Ibid.
11. Ibid.
12. Interview with BG Patricia P. Hickerson, Director, The Adjutant General Directorate, DA PERSCOM, Alexandria, VA, 16 March 1992.
13. Ibid.
14. Army Regulation 600-3, p.27.
15. Interview with LTC(P) Mike Velton, Deputy Chief of Staff, Combined Arms Support Center, Fort Lee, VA, 3 February 1992.
16. Ibid.

17. Interview with BG(P) Frederick E. Vollrath, Director of Enlisted Personnel, DA PERSCOM, Alexandria, VA, 7 February 1992.
18. Interview with MG Theodore G. Stroup, Jr, Director, Program Analysis and Evaluation, Office of the Chief of Staff, Army, Pentagon, 9 March 1992.
19. Ibid.
20. Interview with LTC Ken Stegman, Chief, Adjutant General Proponency and Doctrine Management Office, USA AG School, Fort Benjamin Harrison, IN, 3 February 1992.
21. Ibid.
22. Interview with LTC Dave Mills, Chief, Finance Proponency Office, USA Finance School, Fort Benjamin Harrison, IN, 3 February 1992.
23. Ibid.
24. Interview with LTC Brian Lee, Chief, Leadership Development and Ordnance Proponency Office, Aberdeen Proving Ground, MD, 3 February 1992.
25. Ibid.
26. Interview with COL Cary Allen, Office of the Quartermaster General, Fort Lee, VA, 3 February 1992.
27. Ibid.
28. Interview with LTC Larry Collignon, Director, Office of the Chief of Transportation, Fort Eustis, VA, 3 February 1992.

Bibliography

Army Adjutant General's Corps Regimental Association History, Fort Benjamin Harrison, Indiana, 13 July 1988.

Cheney, Dick, Secretary of Defense, Annual Report to the President and the Congress, Washington, D.C., January 1991.

Department of the Army, Army Doctrine Development, Army Regulation 12-6.

Department of the Army, Army Proponency System, Army Regulation 5 22.

Department of the Army, Personnel Proponency System, Army Regulation 600-3.

Hutzler, Patricia Insley, High Value/Low Visibility - Civil Agency Support for Desert Shield and Desert Storm, A Case Study, Bethesda, MD, March 1992.

Sullivan, Gordon R., General, "Statement before the Committee on Armed Services, U.S. House of Representatives," Washington, D.C., 26 February 1992.

Interviews

Allen, Gary, Colonel, Office of the Quartermaster General, U.S. Army Quartermaster Center and School, Fort Lee, VA: Telephone interviews, February 1992.

Collignon, Larry, Lieutenant Colonel, Director, Office of the Chief of Transportation, U.S. Army Transportation Center and School, Fort Eustis, VA: Telephone interviews, February 1992.

Hickerson, Patricia, Brigadier General, Director, The Adjutant General Directorate, DA PERSCOM, Alexandria, VA: Interview, 16 March 1992.

Kelly, James, Colonel, Chief, Soldier Support Center Liaison Office, Alexandria, VA: Interviews, February 1992.

Lee, Brian, Lieutenant Colonel, Chief, Leadership Development and Ordnance Proponency Office, U.S. Army Ordnance Center and School, Aberdeen Proving Ground, MD: Telephone interviews, February 1992.

Mills, David, Lieutenant Colonel, Chief, Finance Proponency Office, U.S. Army Finance School, U.S. Army Soldier Support Center and Fort Benjamin Harrison, IN: Telephone interviews, February 1992.

Murphy, Robert, Lieutenant Colonel, Chief, Adjutant General Branch, Officer Personnel Directorate, DA PERSCOM, Alexandria, VA: Interview, 14 February 1992.

Stegman, Kenneth, Lieutenant Colonel, Chief, Adjutant General Proponency and Doctrine Management Office, U.S. Army Adjutant General School, U.S. Army Soldier Support Center and Fort Benjamin Harrison, IN: Telephone interview, 3 February 1992.

Stroup, Theodore, Jr., Major General, Director, Program Analysis and Evaluation, Office of the Chief of Staff, Army, Department of the Army, Washington, D.C: Interview, 9 March 1992.

Velton, Michael, Lieutenant Colonel (P), Deputy Chief of Staff, Combined Arms Support Center, Fort Lee, VA: Telephone interview, 3 February 1992.

Vollrath, Frederick, Brigadier General (P), Director of Enlisted Personnel, DA PERSCOM, Alexandria, VA: Interview, 7 February 1992.