



INSTITUTE FOR DEFENSE ANALYSES

Planning and Preparing for Training in Reserve Component Units

John E. Morrison
John Metzko
Charles Hawkins

April 2002

Approved for public release;
distribution unlimited.

IDA Document D-2700

Log: H 02-000244

This work was conducted under contract DASW01 98 C 0067, Task BE-2-1748, for Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Reserve Affairs (OASD/RA). The publication of this IDA document does not indicate endorsement by the Department of Defense, nor should the contents be construed as reflecting the official position of that Agency.

© 2002 Institute for Defense Analyses, 4850 Mark Center Drive, Alexandria, Virginia 22311-1882 • (703) 845-2000.

This material may be reproduced by or for the U.S. Government pursuant to the copyright license under the clause at DFARS 252.227-7013 (NOV 95).

INSTITUTE FOR DEFENSE ANALYSES

IDA Document D-2700

**Planning and Preparing for Training
in Reserve Component Units**

John E. Morrison
John Metzko
Charles Hawkins

PREFACE

This document was prepared for the Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Reserve Affairs/Readiness, Training, and Mobilization under an Institute for Defense Analyses (IDA) task order entitled “Training Management in the Reserve Components.” Colonel Frank Cook, USA, initiated the task. Technical cognizance of the task was assigned to Colonel Keith L. Cooper, USA.

We acknowledge members of the organizations identified in the report for participating in the discussions. The frank and open discussions provided basic valuable data on which we based our observations and recommendations about training management in reserve component (RC) units. In particular, we acknowledge the following individuals for arranging the discussions:

- Mr. Joseph R. Beck, Staff Training Officer, 77th Regional Support Command
- Mr. John Lambert, Staff Operations and Training Officer, 94th Regional Support Command
- Mr. Steve Patarcity, Staff Training Officer, 99th Regional Support Command
- Mr. James Eggleston, Command Executive Officer, 81st Regional Support Command
- Major Kyle Watrous, G-3 Current Operations, 4th Forward Service Support Group
- Mr. Dave Moyer, Chief of Resource Management, US Army Reserve Command
- Brigadier General Walter Wojdakowski, Deputy Commanding General-South, First U.S. Army, Assistant Division Commander-Forward, 24th Infantry Division (Mech)
- Lieutenant Colonel Kenneth Vaughn, Executive Officer, 4th Brigade, 87th Division (Training Support)
- Brigadier General Terry Nesbitt, Commander, 48th Infantry Brigade (Mech)

- Brigadier General John Von Trott, Assistant Division Commander (Maneuver), 28th Infantry Division (Mech)
- Brigadier General Robin Hughes, Assistant Adjutant General, Georgia National Guard

CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	ES-1
I. BACKGROUND	I-1
A. Introduction	I-1
1. Problem	I-1
2. Objective of Study and Organization of Report	I-2
B. Planning Policies, Directives, and Guidelines	I-2
1. Service Doctrine	I-2
2. RC Duty Categories	I-4
C. Method	I-5
1. Discussion Participants	I-7
2. Procedures for Conducting Discussions	I-7
D. Limitations	I-8
II. RESULTS FROM THE DISCUSSIONS	II-1
A. Personnel Issues	II-1
1. Recruitment and Retention	II-1
2. Rate of MOSQ	II-3
B. Training Issues	II-4
1. Deficiencies in Unit Leadership	II-6
2. Shortages of Training Resources and Opportunities	II-7
3. Insufficient Command Emphasis on Unit Training	II-9
4. Mandated Activities That Preempt Training	II-11
5. Changes to Training Schedules	II-12
6. Shortages of Full-Time Personnel	II-12
7. Shortages of Junior Officers	II-14
8. Travel Demands of Training Meetings	II-15
C. Allocation of ATPs and RMPs	II-15
1. Expectations Concerning Reimbursement	II-16
2. Actual Participation at Monthly Meetings	II-17
3. Use of Alternative Forms of Communication	II-17
4. Planning During Drills	II-18
III. OBSERVATIONS AND COMMENTS	III-1
A. Leadership	III-1
B. Process	III-1
C. Responsibility	III-2

IV. RECOMMENDATIONS	IV-1
References	Ref-1
Glossary	GL-1
Appendixes	
Appendix A—Protocol for Conducting Discussions.....	A-1
Appendix B—Additional Comments of Discussion Participants	B-1

TABLES

I-1.	Controlling Organizations and Headquarters Interviewed During Study	I-6
II-1.	Comments Related to R2 Problems	II-2
II-2.	Comments Related to MOSQ Rate	II-3
II-3.	General Comments About the State of Training Management	II-5
II-4.	Comments Related to the Evaluation of Training Management	II-5
II-5.	Comments Related to Deficiencies in Unit Leadership	II-6
II-6.	Comments Related to Shortages of Training Resources and Opportunities	II-8
II-7.	Comments Related to Insufficient Command Emphasis on Unit Training	II-10
II-8.	Comments Related to Mandated Activities That Preempt Training	II-11
II-9.	Comments Related to Changes to Training Schedules	II-12
II-10.	Comments Related to Shortages of Full-Time Personnel	II-13
II-11.	Comments Related to Shortages of Junior Officers	II-14
II-12.	Comments Related to the Allocation of ATPs and RMPs	II-16

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

BACKGROUND

Anecdotal reports indicate that weekend drill training events are often delayed or disorganized, which has led some to suspect that unit commanders and their staffs are ineffective in planning and preparing for weekend training. There are many plausible reasons why training planning and preparation in Reserve Component (RC) units may be ineffective. One problem in particular has received recent interest: RC units do not have enough funds to reimburse unit commanders and their staffs for performing training management functions. This study investigates this problem and others.

We focused our efforts on a homogeneous set of units that we felt had the most serious training management problems: combat support (CS) and combat service support (CSS) ground units. This set includes units in three components: the Army National Guard (ARNG), the United States Army Reserve (USAR), and the United States Marine Corps Reserve (USMCR). To provide perspective, however, we also looked at some combat units in the ARNG, including the active component (AC) and multicomponent organizations that help train them.

A review of Service publications indicated that doctrine and procedures regarding training planning and preparation did not substantially differ between the Army and the Marines. The exception is the guidance for short-range or near-term planning. To prepare for weekend drills, the Army stipulates that monthly face-to-face training meetings must be held before drill weekends and suggests that many unit staff members attend. The Marines, in contrast, indicate that short-term planning can be accomplished by several different means.

To describe current practices related to RC training management issues, we held structured discussions with RC personnel and others who are involved in RC training. A total of 79 individuals assigned to 11 headquarters and controlling organizations located in the Eastern United States participated in these discussions.

Our study of inactive duty training (IDT) training planning was limited in the following respects:

- Although we obtained input from authoritative persons who were knowledgeable of RC training practices, their responses were largely based on their perceptions, which we were not able to validate independently.
- Our primary focus was on CS and CSS elements of the USAR, ARNG, and USMCR, with observations from only a few combat elements of the ARNG.
- Training managers/overseers for the three RCs that were investigated (USAR, ARNG, and USMCR) may not have a common standard for measuring the adequacy of planning and preparation of their units.
- Our visits were limited to controlling organizations and headquarters (HQ) located in the eastern United States.

RESULTS FROM THE DISCUSSIONS

Discussion participants indicated two types of personnel issues had a negative effect on training planning and preparation:

1. **Recruiting and retention (R2).** R2 problems deflect attention away from unit training issues.
2. **Unqualified unit members.** Unit members who are not qualified in their Military Occupation Specialty (MOS) pose problems for training planning.

Participants from the USAR and ARNG agreed that unit training management was a problem for these RCs. However, their opinions about the nature of the problem differed. The USAR and ARNG participants identified the following specific problems:

- **Unit leadership and factors beyond unit leader's control.** In some cases, some participants felt that a failure in unit leadership causes poor planning. Commanders are either unaware of training management practices or are unmotivated to carry them out. Other participants strongly disagreed, asserting that poor planning is more often the result of factors outside the unit leader's control.
- **Lack of training resources.** Participants from CS/CSS units indicated that not having appropriate training resources (access to training areas, training opportunities, training simulations/devices, and so forth) made planning difficult.
- **Insufficient emphasis on training.** Some problems in poor planning and preparation can be traced to insufficient command emphasis on training.

- **Mandated events that interfere with training.** Higher commands often mandate events that preempt training activities and effectively nullify unit training planning and preparation.
- **“Last-minute” cancellations.** In some cases, planning and preparation were negated by training exercise cancellations that occur relatively late in the training management cycle.
- **Lack of full-time training personnel.** Participants agreed that it was advantageous to have full-time personnel engaged in training planning and preparation. In that regard, USAR and ARNG units are experiencing shortages in full-time personnel.
- **Shortage of junior officers.** Army units—the USAR units in particular—are experiencing shortages in junior officers, who perform many administrative functions. These functions are being assumed by unit commanders and senior noncommissioned officers (NCOs), who now have less time to devote to planning and preparation.
- **Travel.** Travel demands make it impractical for many RC units to conduct face-to-face meetings.

Participants agreed that reimbursement issues have little or no effect on training planning. They provided several reasons for this conclusion, including the following:

- Discussion participants indicated that funds are generally not available to pay participants at small unit (company) to plan and prepare for training. This long-standing practice has inured low-level training personnel not to expect to be paid for their planning meetings.
- The number of CS/CSS unit staff members who are needed and who actually attend monthly training meetings is fewer than that specified in Army documents.
- Although face-to-face meetings to plan and prepare unit training have real benefits, the use of modern communications (e.g., e-mail, telephones, web sites) can make the training management effort more efficient. These should be complementary, not competitive, approaches for USAR and ARNG units.
- Planning for future drills is sometimes accomplished on Sunday afternoons or evenings after the conclusion of the drill so that ongoing training activities are not interrupted.

OBSERVATIONS

The discussion responses led us to the following observations regarding training planning and preparation in RC units:

- Individual and group discussions affirmed that many Army RC units have problems with training planning and preparation. Many of these problems relate directly or indirectly to shortcomings in leadership.
- Factors other than shortcomings in leadership also hinder training and training planning and preparation, including
 - Low quality in manpower recruitment pool
 - Inability of the USAR to match state educational benefits available for National Guardsmen
 - Difficulties in recruiting and retaining personnel in large metropolitan areas because of competing employment and entertainment opportunities
 - Shortages in training resources [e.g., training facilities or equipment, access to field training sites, and experienced officers and non-commissioned officers (NCOs)].
- RC units do not always conduct face-to-face meetings as prescribed in Army Field Manual (FM) 25-101, *Battle-Focused Training*; however, alternative modes of communication (e.g., e-mail, telephone, fax, and unit newsletter) may obviate somewhat the need for such meetings.
- FM 25-101 emphasizes the advantage of face-to-face meetings of key personnel to plan and prepare for unit training. More face-to-face meetings of commanders and their next lower-level commanders could also reap benefits by focusing on training issues at both levels.

RECOMMENDATIONS

- Increase the availability of electronic training courseware (e.g., web-based or CD-based training programs) and other training tools during IDT weekends.
- Encourage the use of available communications technology for training planning and preparation.
- Increase full-time staffing of many USAR units.
- Shift funds that would support more additional training periods (ATPs) or readiness management periods (RMPs) to increase full-time staffing.
- Reduce micro-management of unit training.
- Reevaluate policies that induce units to retain nonperformers.

I. BACKGROUND

A. INTRODUCTION

1. Problem

Time is the scarcest training resource for Reserve Component (RC) units. RC units are typically limited to 39 training days per year. Fifteen of those days are allotted to annual training (AT), which leaves only 24 days to conduct weekend drills during inactive duty training (IDT) periods. These 24 IDT periods are normally allotted into twelve 2-day monthly weekend drills that are usually conducted at the company and detachment (small-unit) level and occasionally at the battalion (organizational) level. During those monthly drills, units must train to standard all individual and collective tasks that support the unit's mission essential task list (METL), the inventory of tasks that units must be able perform to accomplish their combat mission. To make the best use of this limited resource, the RC units must carefully plan and prepare for each IDT period.

Anecdotal reports indicate that weekend drill training events are often delayed or disorganized, which has led some to suspect that unit commanders and their staffs are ineffective in planning and preparing for weekend training. If this were true, the deficiency in planning and preparation would have at least three negative consequences:

1. Poorly planned training, which wastes the limited time that reservists have for military training
2. Reduced quality and quantity of training experiences, which makes individuals less inclined to stay in the reserve
3. Inefficient use of training time, which results in lost opportunities to improve unit readiness.

There are many plausible reasons why training planning and preparation in RC units may be ineffective. For instance, the dispersion of RC units and personnel may make face-to-face planning meetings difficult, if not impossible. Another problem is that units may not have enough training resources (e.g., training devices, strategies, facilities, senior leadership) to conduct—or much less to plan for—weekend training. Moreover, units may

lack the full-time support needed to plan and execute training. Also, units may not have the funds to reimburse unit staff members adequately for their planning and preparation efforts. Finally, unscheduled events, mandated activities, and other distractors may preempt training and thereby nullify planning activities. The present study examines these and other problems to determine their impact on training management.

The RCs comprise a large number and variety of units. To focus our efforts, we chose to examine a homogeneous set of units that we felt had the most serious training management problems: combat support (CS) and combat service support (CSS) ground units. This set includes units in three components: the Army National Guard (ARNG), the United States Army Reserve (USAR), and the United States Marine Corps Reserve (USMCR). To provide perspective, however, we also looked at some combat units in the ARNG, including Active Component (AC) and multicomponent organizations that help train them.

2. Objective of Study and Organization of Report

The objective of this study is to describe current RC practices in planning and preparing for unit training. The overall purpose is to identify policy revisions and/or opportunities for improving training management in the RC.

This document is divided into three sections. The present section (Section I) presents background on the requirement for planning in the Army and Marine Corps. Section II presents the principal study findings, which were based on discussions with RC commands and headquarters (HQ). Section III presents some observations based on the results of the discussions. Section IV summarizes the report by presenting a list of recommended policy initiatives for improving training management in RC units.

B. PLANNING POLICIES, DIRECTIVES, AND GUIDELINES

In this subsection, we briefly review Service policies, directives, and guidelines that pertain to planning and preparing for unit training. This summary serves as background for understanding the discussion results, which are discussed in Section II.

1. Service Doctrine

The following document describe Service doctrine and procedures related to training management:

- *Training the Force*, Army Field Manual (FM) 25-100 (Department of the Army, 1988)
- *Battle-Focused Training*, FM 25-101 (Department of the Army, 1990).
- *Unit Training Management Guide*, MCRP 3-0A (Department of the Navy, 1996)
- *How To Conduct Training*, MCRP 3-0B (Department of the Navy, 1996)

With few exceptions, the doctrine and procedures described in Army and Marine Corps documents are identical. For instance, both FM 25-101 and MCRP 3-0A describe training planning as the link between the wartime requirements of a unit as specified by its METL and the execution of training designed to address those requirements. These two documents also describe this link as a three-step process:

1. **Assessment.** The commander, with the assistance of his staff, initiates the planning process by assessing the unit's prior performance on mission-essential tasks. The outcome of this step is the specification of METL subtasks that require more training and define the objectives of the unit-training program.
2. **Commander's guidance.** Based on the commander's assessment, he conveys his training objectives and priorities and specifies major events designed to meet those objectives. This guidance can be in the form of a written letter or memorandum or can be delivered informally as a part of regular monthly training meetings.
3. **Training plans.** The planning process culminates in the publication of detailed unit training plans. These plans are provided in several forms, including yearly training calendars and briefs, quarterly training calendars and briefs, and monthly training calendars and meetings.

Although the terminology between the Army and Marine Corps differs, the two Services depict unit planning processes as occurring within the following three cycles:

1. **Long-range planning.** The longest planning cycle (1–3 years) includes planning for major training events. The principal product of this cycle is a long-range planning calendar, which is a graphic depiction of major events that will occur within the long-range time horizon.
2. **Intermediate-range planning.**¹ The intermediate range of planning converts the general guidance of the long-range plans into detailed training

¹ This cycle is referred to as “short-range” planning by the Army and “midrange” planning by the Marine Corps.

activities, events, and resources. The principal products of this cycle include a detailed 12- to 18-month training calendar and command training guidance.

3. **Preparation for immediate events.**² The shortest planning cycle relates to preparation for immediate training events and covers events in the upcoming quarter (3 months). In this cycle, the training calendar is refined further to produce detailed training schedules.

Preparation for immediate events is typically accomplished through monthly unit training meetings. This is the one area where Army and Marine Corps doctrine differ. The Army regards the monthly training meeting as the primary forum for providing detailed guidance and instructions for the training schedule. Army FM 25-101 states explicitly that these meetings are mandatory: “Training meetings are *non-negotiable* at battalion and company level. They will be held.” (Department of the Army, 1990, pp. 3–28). The manual describes detailed aspects of those monthly meetings, including who should attend and a potential agenda. In contrast, Marine Corps MCRP 3-0A makes no mention of requiring meetings, saying instead that “... short-range planning is accomplished through a variety of means” (Department of the Navy, 1996, pp. 6–15).

2. RC Duty Categories

RC duty categories provide the basis for reimbursing reservists for planning and training. Procedures for using these categories are described in Department of Defense Instruction (DoDI) 1215.19 (Department of Defense, 2000). Reservists are reimbursed for drill training under the category of IDT periods. Activities related to training planning and preparation are covered under a different duty category called “additional” IDT periods. As specified in DoDI 1215.19 (Department of Defense, 2000), two types of additional IDT periods apply to training planning and preparation:

1. Additional training periods (ATPs), which are used “... for accomplishing additional required training, as defined by post-mobilization mission requirements” (p. 6).
2. Readiness management periods (RMPs), which “... are used to support the following functions in preparing units for training: the ongoing day-to-day operation of the unit, accomplishing unit administration, training preparation, support activities, and maintenance functions” (p. 7).

² This cycle is referred to as “near-term” planning by the Army and “short-range” planning by the Marine Corps.

The number of ATPs and RMPs available for planning and preparation is limited:

- The total number of ATPs and RMPs allocated to units is constrained. Units differ in their allocation, but, for even the most richly resourced units, not nearly enough periods are allocated to reimburse all unit staff members for every training meeting.
- RMPs cannot be used during a calendar day in which an IDT or ATP is being conducted. Units regard this as a minor procedural constraint that does not negatively impact planning.
- According to the most recent version of DoDI 1215.19 (Department of Defense, 2000), individuals cannot execute more than 30 ATPs, 30 RMPs, or a total of 54 ATPs and RMPs in combination during a single year. This represents an increase compared with a previous version of DoDI 1215.19 (Department of Defense, 1997) in which limits were set at 12 ATPs, 24 RMPs, and a total of 30 ATPs and RMPs in combination during a single year. However, the increases in the ATPs and RMPs limits were not accompanied by increases in allocations of additional IDT periods to units. Cragin (2000) pointed out that, given the high execution rate of additional IDTs, the unintended result of increasing this limit may be that fewer staff members get reimbursed for planning and preparation.

C. METHOD

To describe current practices related to RC training management issues, we conducted structured but wide-ranging discussions of RC personnel and others involved in RC training. We first considered interviewing a representative sample of units. However, even with the focus on CS and CSS ground elements from the ARNG, USAR, and USMCR, the number of relevant units was well over 2,000, and the number of unit visits required to make reliable generalizations about the RC force would have been prohibitively large. Also, visits would most likely have been confined to weekends and would potentially conflict with ongoing training activities. We determined that interviews and observations of individual units would have consumed too much time and resources and would have resulted in covering an unacceptably small sample of units. Therefore, we limited the discussions to high- and mid-level command organizations, each of which represented aggregations of hundreds of units. Further, we limited the organizations and headquarters to those located in the eastern United States to minimize travel costs. Table I-1 lists the organizations and HQ we visited and includes some basic demographic information on each. Although the sample

Table I-1. Controlling Organizations and Headquarters Interviewed During Study

Command	Location	Number of Discussion Participants	Regional Responsibility	Approximate Number of Reservists Assigned	Number of Units	Number of FSP Units
National Guard Bureau (NGB)	Washington, DC	2	Entire United States	367,000	3,735	–
U.S. Army Reserve Command	Atlanta, Georgia	6	Entire United States	205,000	1,700	500
4 th Marine Force Service Support Group	New Orleans, Louisiana	7	Entire United States	10,000	60	60
81 st Regional Support Command	Birmingham, Alabama	7	Alaska, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Tennessee	30,000	270	127
99 th Regional Support Command	Oakdale, Pennsylvania	13	Delaware, Maryland, Pennsylvania, Virginia, Washington, DC, and West Virginia	18,000	190	60
77 th Regional Support Command	Fort Totten, New York	14	New Jersey, New York, and part of Pennsylvania	11,000	130	30
94 th Regional Support Command	Devon, Massachusetts	9	Connecticut, Massachusetts, Maine, New Hampshire, Rhode Island, and Vermont	6,500	60	13
24 th Infantry Division (Forward)	Fort Jackson, South Carolina	4	Georgia, North Carolina, and South Carolina	12,000	120	0
28 th Infantry Division	Harrisburg, Pennsylvania	4	Pennsylvania	17,500	212	0
48 th Infantry Brigade	Macon, Georgia	7	Georgia	4,000	38	0
4 th Brigade, 87 th Division (Training Support)	Fort Stewart, Georgia	6	Georgia	722 *	35	0

* Multicomponent element comprising Army AC, RC, and AGR personnel. Total reflects all personnel in brigade, regardless of component.

was limited to units from a single geographical section, this table indicates that they differed widely in setting (urban vs. rural) and in training resources. Thus, the sample presents a diversity of training management problems.

1. Discussion Participants

We conducted face-to-face interviews with representatives from the 11 organizations and HQ listed in Table 1. In all, we interviewed 79 personnel, which included senior non-commissioned officers (NCOs) through general officers. All interview participants were intimately involved in the supervision of training planning. In that capacity, many had visited units with the express purpose of observing training and training management. Most of the participants were full-time employees stationed at HQ sites. In addition to their HQ duties, some of the participants also were members of reserve units and, as such, were actively involved in unit training management. Further, as members of the HQ units, participants shared observations and experiences of the current situation in training planning, all of which provided a common base of knowledge and values concerning training management.

2. Procedures for Conducting Discussions

Unit information was obtained through structured discussions. The discussions were guided by a protocol (see Appendix A) that comprised three types of items:

- The first item related to statistics concerning the ability of the organization to monitor training of subordinate units.
- The second item related to procedures for unit training planning, preparation, and execution.
- The third item concerned detailed questions about unit training.

The protocol defined the common set of issues that were discussed with all units.

Two discussion leaders were involved in 7 of the 11 sessions, and a single leader collected data for the other 4 sessions. Although the topics listed on the protocol were the starting points of the meetings, the interviewers often permitted the discussions to shift to related topics. However, discussion leaders were careful to lead tangential conversations back to the protocol topics.

Detailed notes from the discussions and follow-up phone conversations were transcribed into memoranda for the record. The comments were then subjected to a content analysis to determine common themes. A simple database was used to consolidate and manipulate the text from these memoranda and the codes for themes.

D. LIMITATIONS

The method, and therefore the results and conclusions, of the present study were subject to the following limitations:

- Although we obtained input from authoritative persons who were knowledgeable of RC training practices, their responses were largely based on their perceptions. Available resources made it impossible to validate independently those perceptions either through direct observation of training practices or formal surveys of opinion.
- Our primary focus was on CS and CSS elements of the USAR, ARNG, and USMCR. Only a few combat elements from the ARNG were considered. Thus, our study did not consider the other RCs—namely, the Navy Reserve (NAVRES), the Air Force Reserve (AFR), and the Air National Guard (ANG).
- Training managers/overseers for the three RCs that were investigated (USAR, ARNG, and USMCR) may not have a common standard for measuring the adequacy of planning and preparation of their units.
- Our visits were limited to controlling organizations and HQ located in the eastern United States.

II. RESULTS FROM THE DISCUSSIONS

A total of 189 individual comments were collected from the discussions. Of those, 134 were directly relevant to training management and/or personnel issues that impact training management. These comments are discussed in this section. To preserve the anonymity of the participants, the comments are identified only by component, not by unit. The remaining 55 comments (see Appendix B) were statements of fact and opinion that, while relevant to the general state of training in the unit, did not pertain directly to training management.

The results were conceptually divided into two large sets or tracks. The first track pertains to demographic and personnel issues. Data are summarized in Table I-1, and comments are described in Section II.A. The second track pertains to training in particular and other important issues that potentially impact training management. These training issues are discussed in Section II.B. The second track also addresses the specific problem of reimbursement, which is presented in Section II.C.

A. PERSONNEL ISSUES

To plan unit training, unit leaders must have a stable base of personnel who are qualified to receive the training. Two types of issues make such stability problematic: difficulties in recruiting and retention (R2) and the rate (i.e., percent) of military occupation skill qualification (MOSQ).

1. Recruitment and Retention

Table II-1 presents statements related to problems in recruiting and retaining personnel in RC units. The USAR and ARNG both reported pervasive R2 problems, which have a negative impact on training management in their components. The USMCR reported few problems in this regard.

Turnover is a particular problem for the USAR. Discussion participants reported turnover ranging from a low of 17 percent, which was regarded as manageable, to a high of 34 percent, which was seen as problematic. Employer concern over losing employees to

Table II-1. Comments Related to R2 Problems

Source	Statement
USAR	• The manpower pool from which the RSC [Regional Support Command] recruits does not, in general, provide the caliber (intelligence, attitude, motivation) of personnel the RSC really wants. • Major urban locations offer many employment and entertainment alternatives to joining or staying in the Army Reserve. • USAR [United States Army Reserve] loses reservists and candidate reservists to the ARNG, which offers better benefits. • The biggest job of commanders and first sergeants is recruiting. • The USARC (United States Army Reserve Command) and the ARNG compete for soldiers. For example, two Engineer battalions, one in the USAR and the other in the ARNG, are located 50 miles apart. State benefits give the ARNG an advantage. • Difficulties in recruiting and retention—34-percent annual turnover—make it necessary for warm bodies to be valued more than soldier competence. Observed that even among officers, a unit commander with a 10-percent level of competence is better than no commander at all. • Although the urban environment does not seem conducive to good training for reservists, the RSC staff believes that the men do want meaningful work in their skill areas. And they believe that good, tough training helps retention.
ARNG	• The full range of personnel issues (recruiting, retention, turbulence, ghost soldiers, and so forth) are major training detractors. • The R2 problem ... is pervasive and dominates commanders at all levels. The requirement to access and maintain required strength levels ... means that some training doesn't get done and other training is done poorly. • It is difficult for the USAR to recruit and retain soldiers because of the superior benefits offered by the Guard. • The MTW [major theater warfare] readiness backfill by enhanced separate brigades [eSBs] just going to or coming off an NTC [National Training Center] or JRTC [Joint Readiness Training Center] rotation means that the members of those eSBs are stabilized before and after the rotation. This adds some continuity to personnel, reduces turbulence, and helps improve and sustain readiness. • Some members of one state's ARNG feel that OPTEMPO [Operations Tempo] caused by recent NTC rotation is too high, which will cause personnel to leave and will affect recruiting. However, in another state, it is predicted that a recent rotation to Bosnia will have little effect on current high levels of recruiting and may actually increase retention. • One respondent echoed successful military commanders in history (e.g., Rommel, B.H. Liddel Hart), saying that "good training is the best welfare for the soldier." Soldiers want good training, and good training is an essential part of the reason why good soldiers reenlist. • Lack of meaningful training is the number one reason why soldiers leave the Guard.
USMCR	Turnover is relatively low (15 percent), and recruiting is not a significant problem.

overseas deployments was cited as a retention challenge. Frequent activations and deployments were also cited as reasons for turnover; however, this sentiment was not universally held. Some participants felt that combat experiences are the reason that reservists join a

unit, and the possibility of deployment is a recruiting lure rather than a retention challenge. Similarly, some complained that National Training Center (NTC) and the Joint Readiness Training Center (JRTC) rotations are disruptive to unit retention efforts. Others indicated that backfill efforts in connection with those rotations actually increase unit stability.

The relationship between R2 and training is bi-directional. Training quality may suffer from inordinate attention to recruiting (complicated by turnover problems) at the expense of training management. However, R2 is also negatively impacted because poor training is a major reason why men and women leave the reserves. Thus, R2 problems have a negative impact on training, and poor training can lead to R2 problems.

2. Rate of MOSQ

MOSQ refers to individuals in units who are qualified in their military specialty and are thus eligible for unit training. Table II-2 lists the respondent comments on this issue. Only two organizations provided quantitative data on their MOSQ rate. Their estimates seemed neither remarkably high nor low; however, the actual duty MOSQ or duty military occupational skill qualification (DMOSQ) rate was much lower than the MOSQ in the one reported case. The DMOSQ rate includes only those soldiers who are military occupational specialty (MOS)-qualified for their current position.

Table II-2. Comments Related to MOSQ Rate

Source	Statement
USAR	• About 70 percent are MOS-qualified and 58 percent are DMOS-qualified. Medical units account for 20 percent of the RSC's personnel and about 50 percent of the officers. • About 65 percent of RSC personnel are MOS-qualified. Attendance for IDT averages about 65 percent. • At any time, 800 to 1,000 recruits are awaiting basic training and AIT (advanced individual training). There are about 150 split-option reservists.
ARNG	• MOSQ and DMOSQ rates are higher than other Guard divisions. • MOSQ training needs to be taken to the soldier. Most soldiers are not fully MOS-qualified after AIT. The Guard has a problem with this because of time and distance. The AC does not. Some skills require as much as two AT periods and intervening IDT weekends to get a soldier fully MOS-qualified after AIT. • A minimum level of personnel readiness should be established before proceeding to collective training.
USMCR	No comments on this issue.

Having a low proportion of personnel who are MOS-qualified limits the kind and amount of training for which units plan, prepare, and execute. For instance, participants

from an ARNG command made the point that individuals are not permitted to participate in collective exercises until they are qualified in their duty positions.

A low rate of MOSQ may be the result of several factors. Personnel turbulence has a negative effect on MOSQ as does the redesignation of units from one type to another (e.g., CS to CSS). Even if new recruits are sent to the appropriate initial training course, they may not be eligible for training upon completion. Many elect for “split options,” where they enter basic training upon enlistment, but delay advanced individual training (AIT) for a year or so while serving as members of the unit. The problem is that these personnel are not eligible for unit training until completion of AIT. Further, as members of one ARNG organization indicated, most soldiers are not fully MOS-qualified even after AIT.

B. TRAINING ISSUES

Table II-3 presents general comments about training management in RC units. These comments, although general in nature, confirm that training planning and preparation is a serious problem for USAR and ARNG units. The USMCR did not indicate that their CS and CSS units were experiencing problems in this regard.

Discussion participants’ comments indicated that most based their comments on direct observation of unit training. However, as implied in their comments listed in Table II-4, these participants did not necessarily have a common standard for measuring the adequacy of planning and preparation in their units. Most participants conveyed the sentiment that the best indication of good training management was unit readiness. However, we also noted a tendency for participants to define indications of good training management in terms of their own personal background and interests. For instance, one commander felt that the physical condition of the unit was an indication of training management. An overseer of RC resources said that deficiencies in money management skills are often correlated with training management problems, perhaps reflecting shortcomings in general leadership and organizational skills. A logistician felt that the rate of requests for training support was a direct indication of training management. However, the most direct and perhaps most valid method for evaluating unit planning was developed by the 94th RSC, which incorporated training planning and preparation as an explicit part of an assistance and assessment program for improving the participation and quality of IDT weekends. This part of their assessment package was designed to provide units feedback on the quality of their training leadership, including time management issues.

Table II-3. General Comments About the State of Training Management

Source	Statement
USAR	• Effective training in the RSC is inhibited by the fact that training planning is poor in many battalions and companies. • ... training planning ... is regarded as one of the weaker areas in the USAR. • Late planning for IDT weekends in the RSC is a major problem. Too often, training planning is done during the initial Saturday hours of the training period. • Although training management procedures were well known in the RSC, there were instances in which units did not conduct IDT on the weekends indicated on their training schedules, and several instances in which the training did not match the units' YTPs [yearly training program].
ARNG	• Training management is the number one weakness in the RC. It is also a weakness in the AC, but maybe not as acute. • Companies from one of the brigades very often do not conduct training meetings. Meetings are spotty at the battalion level. • Last-minute training planning is a problem. • There was some wasted time at the beginning of IDT periods because training was not prepared for or resourced beforehand. • A lot of training doesn't happen. Also, training schedules at the company level are seldom locked-in 3 months in advance and often are being adjusted the month before the IDT weekend in which training is to occur. • Company training meetings vary widely. Sometimes they are conducted, sometimes not, and not all are done the same way. Same with battalions. • Training schedules are poorly adhered to and are not followed in many cases. No one seems to be held accountable.
USMCR	No comments on this issue.

Table II-4. Comments Related to the Evaluation of Training Management

Source	Statement
USAR	• All interviewees believed that a strong link exists between training state (i.e., training readiness) and training management. • An interesting response to a question about how the training staff recognizes a unit with good training management: The unit that's always asking for support. • The commander said, from his own experience, that there are some dead giveaways for units that suffer from problems in training management: – If he's not properly greeted at the door, indicating a general lack of awareness – If the family readiness office is not properly staffed and functioning – If the bathroom is dirty and unkempt.
ARNG	• Good training management is correlated with good money management.
USMCR	• The MARFORRES [Marine Forces Reserve] uses the following for monitoring training state/training readiness: (1) MCCRES (Marine Corps Combat Readiness Evaluation System) is a third-party evaluation of units performing in CAX [combined arms exercises]; (2) SORTS [Status of Resources and Training System] provides MOSQ information; and (3) Tempo is both an indicator and a determinant that a units is being used regularly. Low tempo might signify a readiness problem.

Whereas the preceding comments described the general state of RC unit training management, the following subsections discuss some possible specific problems that units face.

1. Deficiencies in Unit Leadership

The discussion participants indicated that, in some cases, some sort of failure in unit leadership causes poor planning. Commanders are either unaware of training management practices or are not motivated to carry them out. Some of the comments, listed in Table II-5, support this assertion.

Table II-5. Comments Related to Deficiencies in Unit Leadership

Source	Statement
USAR	• The RSC observed that the wholesale buyouts of officers and NCOs during the last decade diminished the training competence of the USAR.
ARNG	• The Guard assignment system is based on politics and not merit. Also, promotions are often affected strongly by politics, even though the individual must meet the same criteria as AC personnel. • Company-level skills (Captain skills) need emphasis and are generally lacking. • Division junior officers are mostly homegrown via OCS [Officer Candidate School] or come from active duty. Company commanders don't know what "right looks like." • Training management and training execution are problems in the division. More money and time isn't necessarily the solution, but knowing how to manage and plan training is critical. • Some company commanders think that the training schedule is a "living document" and that changes could be made any time. • Part of the problem is that appropriate training regulations and manuals are not available at the battalion and company levels (and at brigade and division levels in some cases). Unit suggests reviving the BTMS [Battalion Training Management System], which has been out of use for 10–15 years. • Despite leadership problems, "some Guard officers in this division can do their jobs better than any active duty officer."
USMCR	• The Support Group's biggest need is multiple-skilled senior officers and NCOs as leaders and models for young reservists. Although all officers have served in the AC, their skills erode over time. Active duty officers generally sustain or improve their skills.

One of the interviewees pointed out that the Infantry Officer Basic Course (IOBC), for example, only has a 3-hour block of instruction on training management. Most active duty lieutenants can learn on the job, but AC platoon leaders and company executive officers do not have the same exposure and do not acquire appropriate management skills and knowledge. As indicated in Table II-5, one ARNG staffer noted that training regulations and manuals are not generally available to units. For that reason, an AC NCO advisor in

this unit developed computer-based courseware that combines existing documentation in a form that is accessible to most reservists who need to know more about training management. The division commander has adopted this program as mandatory training for all company-grade officers and battalion commanders and staff.

Some of the comments in Table II-5 reflect the perception that the RC recruits inferior-quality officers and suggest that they may not be up to task of training management. One ARNG respondent strongly disagreed with this perception, however, and asserted that some Guard officers are exemplary and more capable than their AC counterparts.

Many discussion participants disagreed with the basic assertion that poor planning is primarily the result of leaders not knowing how or not being motivated to plan correctly. While they agreed that planning in their unit was not as good as they would like, they asserted that poor planning is more often the result of factors outside of the unit leaders' control. The remaining subsections (II.B.2–II.B.8) discuss some of the external factors that discussion participants raised as reasons for problems in training management.

2. Shortages of Training Resources and Opportunities

A basic assumption for training planning and preparation is that the unit has the opportunity to train. Such opportunities depend on the unit's ability to provide appropriate job experiences, to gain access to training areas, and to exploit the use of training aids, devices, simulators, and simulations (TADSS). As indicated by the number of comments in Table II-6, there are shortages of such opportunities and resources—particularly in USAR units. The ARNG (mostly combat units) had fewer comments in this regard than did the CS and CSS units in the USAR and USMCR. This difference may reflect the perception that most TADSS are, in fact, designed for combat as opposed to CS or CSS, applications.

The comments indicate that the availability of training resources and opportunities depend on the type of unit. For instance, one USAR command indicated that although they had a formal hands-on training program for maintenance personnel, hands-on training for other fields (e.g., medical or transportation units) is much less available and depends (in the words of one participant) on “leaders’ creativity.” While most units acknowledged the potential of computer-based simulator training to provide hands-on practice, relevant training technologies have not been developed for most CS/CSS units—especially in comparison with combat units.

**Table II-6. Comments Related to Shortages of
Training Resources and Opportunities**

Source	Statement
USAR	• For tasks and MOSs that must be trained via hands-on methods (e.g., mechanics, truck drivers, medical corpsmen), the command actively seeks training experiences (even real-world missions) that provide the needed context for practice. However, most of these experiences are limited to AT, not during IDT periods. • Good planning/management of training ... does not make up for shortages in funding, hands-on equipment training (e.g., heavy equipment transporters, which cannot be driven on public roads), and TADSS. Hands-on training is generally limited to AT. • Although the RSC staff says it has a formal hands-on training program for maintenance personnel, hands-on training for other fields depends on leaders' creativity. Some, but not much, computer-based simulator training—for crane operators and rifle marksmanship—is available. • About 25–30 percent of units interact with other components or services during AT. • As in other RSCs, few AT opportunities involve missions that run longer than 2 weeks and thus require assignment of 2 units or parts of 2 units in tandem. • All units are expected to participate in an “integrated” mission during AT, but this goal is usually not met. • Command FSP (Force Support Package) units often participate during AT in JRTC and NTC rotations. • Lanes training is conducted at AT and, in a few cases, during IDT. • FSP units participate in computer-mediated staff exercises every year. • Joint training opportunities are rare. There are some opportunities for Overseas Deployment Training missions, the Military Traffic Management Command, and JRTC/NTC rotations, but most USAR exercises are “unit-type” specific and do not involve other components or Services. • The USARC near equivalent to the ARNG's MATES (Mobilization and Training Equipment Site) is the ECS (Equipment Concentration Site), which is the venue for intermediate-level and perhaps depot-level maintenance training. • Field training sites are remote so that field training is limited to two trips per year for weapons qualification ... activities that generate noise or smoke must be avoided. • Units conduct very little hands-on training during IDT periods: – Those medical reservists who don't work in hospitals would profit from meaningful on-the-job training (not orderly work), but hospitals find record keeping for such training (as free OJT [on-the-job training] staff) too burdensome. – Maintenance units often fail to arrange hands-on intermediate work for their reservists. – Truck drivers do not get enough practice, and what practice they do get is inefficient. A large group of 88Ms (Motor Transport Operators) will sit and wait while one man drives the one truck that is available.
ARNG	• A general lack of resources was cited, meaning there is not enough funding to provide training aids, devices, and the like in all cases.

**Table II-6. Comments Related to Shortages of
Training Resources and Opportunities (Continued)**

Source	Statement
USMCR	• CSS reservists are assigned to support CAX with 4th MarDiv units during AT. Joint training with active Marine units is infrequent since the latter usually conduct their CAX during the winter. Individuals and units that do not train in CAX are assigned MOS-relevant jobs during AT. • The maintenance battalion, which is responsible for intermediate-level maintenance, is able to provide its mechanics hands-on training at IDT periods and at AT. • About 25 percent of AT periods is spent with active Marine units. About 10 to 15 percent of AT periods is spent training with other Services (American or foreign). Some units—not many—train with other units during IDT periods.

Some of the participating commands indicated arranging for CS/CSS units to train skills in a tactical context is a challenge. The comments indicated that USAR units located in large urban areas are particularly hard pressed to provide any sort of field training. Other USAR commands commented that hands-on tactical training in their command is largely limited to AT. Units also commented that the 2-week timeframe for annual training sets a restriction on the scope of training activities in which reservists can be involved.

Except for high-priority [e.g., Force Support Package (FSP)] units, USAR participants indicated that providing combined arms and joint training experiences (which are usually reserved for large-scale exercises at the combat training centers) is particularly difficult. At the same time, these joint and combined arms experiences are particularly important for CS and CSS reservists so that they can see the connection between their functions and combat effectiveness. Although unit leaders may recognize the need for combined arms and joint training experiences, the arrangement and coordination for such large-scale events must be carried out at the national level [i.e., at USARC for the Army or at the 4th Force Service Support Group (FSSG) for the Marines] to match CS/CSS units with combat units that require support; therefore, local unit involvement in planning is minimal.

3. Insufficient Command Emphasis on Unit Training

As indicated in Table II-7, statements from the USAR and ARNG imply that problems in planning and preparation can also be traced to insufficient command emphasis on unit training. This lack of emphasis is manifest in other complaints, such as the issue discussed earlier (see Section II.A.1) that some USAR commands consider personnel issues a higher priority than training. This problem is also reflected in the fact (discussed

**Table II-7. Comments Related to Insufficient
Command Emphasis on Unit Training**

Source	Statement
USAR	• RSC's first priority is maintaining strength (recruiting and retaining personnel), and its second priority is personnel qualification (training). • The RSC observed that command is no longer desirable. The Army emphasis on zero defects increasingly deters competent captains and field grade officers from seeking command assignments. • An RSC captain, who recently had been in an Ohio Guard unit, turned down an opportunity to command a company in either the Guard or the Reserve because (1) the Guard did not conduct any meaningful training and (2) the pressures and risks of command in either component are not balanced by the authority for a commander to exercise his own judgment in making decisions. In administrative and operational directives, higher echelons have left little need for his judgment.
ARNG	• Training meetings often do not occur, because ... there is no command emphasis to conduct them. Extra resources won't make a difference until there is a culture of responsibility for doing the right thing. • A lot of old timers in the Guard remember when the Guard was not going to be used unless World War III broke out. Today, they're being used with increasing regularity, and, if even a minor war happens, the Guard is going to be involved in it. "People will die, and all because the system does not promote good training." • The Army recently emphasized filling divisions at the expense of TDA [Table of Distribution and Allowance] units. Now, TDA units, such as training support divisions, have to give up personnel to send to TRADOC [Training and Doctrine Command] to help write doctrine. Seventy manuals need to be updated, but no one is available to update them.
USMCR	No comments on this issue.

later in Sections II.B.4 and II.B.5) that higher commands are often unwilling to protect their planned training from mandated briefings and other ad hoc requirements that detract from training. One ARNG respondent argued that perhaps the most fundamental problem is that training meetings and other training management functions do not occur because leadership does not inculcate the appropriate "culture of responsibility" in subordinate units.

The command emphasis problem is so severe that it has caused morale problems among junior leaders. Participants from two different USAR commands reported instances in which junior officers refused to take company command slots because higher HQ was not perceived as supporting good training and did not permit leaders to assert their authority in training planning and other administrative and operational matters.

4. Mandated Activities That Preempt Training

As summarized in Table II-8, participants from the USAR and USMCR indicated that higher commands often mandate events that preempt training activities and effectively nullify unit training plans and preparation. To provide an example, discussion participants from one USAR command related an incident in which units had to complete urine analysis of all unit members within 30 to 60 days of notification. Participants also gave examples of mandated events in which the unit was required to use training time to convey non-training-related information (e.g., changes in policies, retirement announcements, and changes to unit chain of command). The USMCR respondents remarked that such information could be transmitted by newsletters or web sites, thereby freeing up more drill time for training.

Table II-8. Comments Related to Mandated Activities That Preempt Training

Source	Statement
USAR	• Training distracters—primarily nonmission training and mandatory briefings on topics that some consider nonessential and even frivolous—are the major concern. • Although not frequent, training disruptions result when higher command levels (DA [Department of the Army], FORSCOM [United States Army Forces Command], or USARC) mandate a distracter that preempts time for scheduled tactical/technical training (e.g., a urinalysis for all personnel in the next 30 to 60 days). • Estimates vary (from 25 to 50 percent) as to the portion of IDT periods that is usually devoted to METL tasks. • Nontactical/nontechnical training accounts for 20 to 30 percent of IDT time. We heard no complaint that such training was a significant training distracter. • An estimated 30 to 35 percent of training time is devoted to tactical training or technical training.
ARNG	No comments on this issue.
USMCR	• About 15 to 20 percent of IDT time is spent on nontactical or nontechnical training. Some of the other training, which is viewed as necessary and important, will be put into newsletters and on web sites.

The discussion leaders also asked participants to estimate the average percent of IDT drill time occupied by nontechnical or nontactical training issues, such as equal employment opportunity (EEO) briefings, ceremonies, and so forth. Participants provided estimates of weekend IDT time occupied with such nontechnical or nontactical issues. This time ranged from a low of 15 percent to a high of 50 percent. In a related effort, USARC is conducting a study to identify unit training distractors and quantify the time requirements of each. The goal of the study is to move these activities, which are now conducted during drills, to post-mobilization training. The results so far indicate that about 9 hours could be successfully eliminated from drill time, saving a little more than 1 day or 2 IDT periods.

5. Changes to Training Schedules

As reflected in the comments in Table II-9, two USAR commands related incidents in which unit planning and preparation were negated by late and unexpected cancellations of exercises. Such changes are usually caused by funding shortages. Table II-9 also presents two incidents in which mobilization had unexpected effects on nondeploying units. The common theme of these comments was that unexpected changes to the schedule can sometimes nullify careful planning.

Table II-9. Comments Related to Changes to Training Schedules

Source	Statement
USAR	• Funding shortages and late notification that funds are not available for planned exercises cause cascading disruptions in training and training planning. Units proceed with their training in accordance with high-level training plans only to learn 90 or fewer days before AT that funds are not available or are much reduced, so that AT plans must change. • The RSC observed that no matter how well training is planned/managed, late cancellation (a few weeks) of a scheduled exercise can be a big training disrupter for the participating unit. • Getting two units—Engineers and MPs—with 300 personnel ready for Bosnia/Kosovo affects units with about 1,000 personnel by reducing funds for the nondeployers' AT and rescheduling their AT periods to accommodate the deployers.
ARNG	• Longer lead-time notification is necessary to plan and execute stated mobilization support as demonstrated in the recent train-up of units for Bosnia. This means that the mobilization orders issued by DA need to be given much earlier than if it were an AC unit going to Bosnia.
USMCR	No comments on this issue.

It is also instructive to note that, in all cases, respondents indicated that commanders were able to react to the unexpected changes and make adjustments so that some relevant training took place. Their stories reflected a common sentiment: such changes should be avoided; however, they are sometimes inevitable, and leaders must adjust accordingly.

6. Shortages of Full-Time Personnel

The comments in Table II-10 indicate that unit training management is enhanced or facilitated by the participation of full-time personnel as either full members of or advisors to RC units. In the USMCR, AC personnel typically hold key staff positions within the unit (e.g., S-3 or S-4) and directly participate in unit planning and preparation. The Army uses

Table II-10. Comments Related to Shortages of Full-Time Personnel

Source	Statement
USAR	• Observed that many units that have commanders with less-than-required competence are also saddled with low-level, low-caliber (intelligence, attitude, and motivation) AGRs, who should, but don't, help plan and prepare unit training. • Fewer and lower grade AGRs on MSC [Major Subordinate Command] staffs (relative to the RSC staff) limit the training oversight capability of the MSCs.
ARNG	• A key to training management is integration with the TSBs (Training Support Brigades). There are three TSBs, one for each of the eSBs. However, the TSBs also provide support for other state Guard units (under state trooper commands) and sometimes (depending on the commander) for the AC as well. • The TSBs and battalions are kept at 98 percent of authorized strength, mostly officers and senior NCOs. The AC is meeting its commitment to the RC in this regard, but the RC is not responding in kind. The eSBs are running at 70-percent strength and the full-time support (AGR) are at 55 percent. More full-time members are desperately needed. • For those units of the brigade remaining in Georgia, one AC captain in one brigade's S3 shop has made a difference. His unit has quality AT as opposed to mediocre AT. Recall that the brigade's principal staff officers and NCOs are all in Bosnia. • Full-time manning is a big problem. More full-time personnel are desperately needed. • Because of a lack of full-time support, AC members of the TSBs and TSBNs [Training Support Battalions] often help to resource training. Two full timers can't do the work of four, and, when four are needed, some things fall through the cracks or wait until the last minute when the pressure becomes greatest. • The AGR shortage in the ARNG has become so severe that units are starting to share AGRs.
USMCR	• Inspector-instructor active duty Marines are the backbone for training management. Coordination with their reservist commanders enables them to take care of the planning and preparation for IDT weekends and for AT. They typically hold key staff positions (e.g., S-3 and S-4).

Active Guard and Reserve (AGR) personnel to help in unit training planning and preparation. In particular, the unit's training NCO, usually an AGR position, is a primary player in preparing a unit for training. Also, active duty advisers who work closely with the operations sections of ARNG enhanced brigades facilitate training management.

The problem is that many AGR slots are currently not filled in USAR and ARNG units. According to one of the participants, the problem has become so severe that ARNG units are now sharing AGRs. Discussion participants agreed that shortages in full-time personnel have had a detrimental effect on training planning and preparation. In fact, members of different commands informally commented that if the Department of Defense (DoD) wanted to spend money to improve training planning, it should "buy" more full-time (AGR or AC) personnel rather than spending money on additional ATPs or RMPs.

Although the value of full-time personnel to training management is undeniable, participants raised cautions. Units that recruit low-quality leaders who are poor training managers are also likely to tolerate lower quality AGRs who do not help ameliorate the leader problem. A representative from the Office of the Secretary of Defense (OSD) added that there is DoD-wide recognition that full-time support of the RC must be increased. However, he also noted that if full-time support were dramatically increased above the current allocation of one or two per unit (an unlikely development), RC units would begin to resemble AC units and lose some of their inherent and unique advantages.

7. Shortages of Junior Officers

As indicated in Table II-11, USAR units are having particular trouble attracting new officers, particularly graduates from college Reserve Officer Training Corps (ROTC) programs. One command reported that only about 2 percent of a recent pool of ROTC graduates opted for the USAR. A select few enter active duty, but most elect to become part of the Inactive Ready Reserve (IRR) until their Service obligation is completed. For the most part, the USAR draws officers from those who leave active duty and from the ranks of USAR NCOs.

Table II-11. Comments Related to Shortages of Junior Officers

Source	Statement
USAR	• The RSC observed that a shortage of officers (lieutenants and captains, primarily) seems to be the result of few ROTC graduates—75 out of about 3,500—opting for the USAR. Most ROTC graduates go into the Active Army (i.e., those who do not elect to go into the IRR). • Effective training in the RSC is inhibited by the fact that not enough lieutenants are available so reservist NCOs lead many units while also being responsible for their own duties. • RSC R2 problems and the shortage of 2nd lieutenants make it difficult to grow a new unit into a viable FSP unit in less than 5 years. • It is tough to get 2nd lieutenants, who generally prefer the Active Army or ARNG for their obligated duty. It is also difficult to compete with the ARNG for personnel since the states offer college tuition benefits. In addition, the home state National Guard has just begun to offer a year of free graduate school tuition for Guardsmen. • New lieutenants for the RSC are obtained primarily through direct commissioning. ROTC requires, at minimum, that graduates go on inactive reserve. They tend to choose either that or active duty.
ARNG	• Twenty years ago, the major personnel problem was in the senior ranks of the ARNG. Now, the critical problem is in the junior officer ranks.
USMCR	No comments on this issue.

The shortage of junior officers is also creating shortages in junior leadership positions. In one command, shortages are so severe that NCOs, in addition to their own duties, must assume the administrative duties of junior officers. Some units in which leaders are in particularly short supply are missing commanding officers and are being led temporarily by NCOs. As a result, training planning and preparation are performed by untrained or inexperienced personnel or are not performed at all.

8. Travel Demands of Training Meetings

Only one USAR command commented on the travel demands of training meetings, commenting that “the efficacy of holding training planning sessions during the week in the RSC is undermined by lack of pay and long travel time/distance for many participants.” Despite the lack of comments, all are aware that travel demands make regular monthly training meetings difficult, if not impossible. It is the exception, rather than the rule, that RC unit staff members live within easy driving or commuting distance of their HQ and/or armory. In addition to traveling to monthly drills, the additional demand to travel to training meetings during the workweek is overly burdensome to many staff members. Also, the comments indicated that the RC does not have a clear policy for liability related to travel to meetings for which personnel may not be reimbursed. In short, for many units, holding monthly face-to-face training meetings of all staff members is a practical impossibility.

C. ALLOCATION OF ATPs AND RMPs

Table II-12 summarizes comments related to the allocation of ATPs and RMPs and other resources to units for planning. Notably absent from these comments is the sentiment that not reimbursing staff members causes poor planning. Discussion participants acknowledged the normal allocation of additional IDT periods was not enough to reimburse the staff for all planning and preparation activities. On the other hand, when asked directly about the effects of actual increases to ATPs and RMPs, discussion participants were nearly unanimous in their opinion that simply increasing allocations of additional IDT periods was not likely to address training management problems.

In that regard, most of the discussion participants were unaware that the limits on total ATPs and RMPs had been recently increased from 30 to 54 periods. Although most participants commented that the increase provided more flexibility for reimbursing staff for planning and preparation, they did not think that it would have much effect because the change was not accompanied by increased funds for additional IDT periods.

Table II-12. Comments Related to the Allocation of ATPs and RMPs

Source	Statement
USAR	• The RSC was unaware of the DoDI 1215.19 change in ATPs and RMPs. There was a consensus that the additional ATPs and RMPs and even increased funding would not improve training. • The RSC receives about 23,000 ATPs per year ... and the MSEs [Major Subordinate Elements] allocate funds to subordinate battalions for ATPs/RMPs and monitor down to the company level.
ARNG	• Training management and training execution are problems in the division. More money and time isn't necessarily the solution, but knowing how to manage and plan training is critical ... [however] ... one additional funded MUTA [Multiple Unit Training Assembly] per month would probably be a good thing. This would add 12 four-hour periods, the equivalent of 3 additional weekends, increasing the 39-day number to 45. • State controls distribution of money for ATPs/RMPs, and it may not get distributed as equitably as necessary. • Funding for training management would be a help, especially for IDT. • Funding for ATPs/RMPs gets down late, and reallocation of unused funds at the 11th month is also a problem. • STARCs [State Area Commands] are not requesting more ATP/RMP funding, and they are converting some of the existing funds for other functions, namely short school courses. In general, school training is perceived to be a higher funding priority than unit training.
USMCR	• RMPs and ATPs are fully funded. While the associated combat division requests and receives RMP/ATP funds, the support group finds it easier to use ADSW [Active Duty for Special/Support Work] funding for planning and preparation. As funds are moved down the chain, each echelon typically holds back a portion of the allotment, which amounts to not-quite-just-in-time funding for the lower echelon units. Mid-year meetings, which break loose the holdbacks, typically result in accelerated spending by those units in the second half of the year.

The following subsections present responses from discussion participants that suggest why the allocation of ATPs and RMPs has such a limited impact on training management issues.

1. Expectations Concerning Reimbursement

Although not explicitly stated as a comment, a common sentiment expressed by the survey participants was that unit staff members do not expect to be reimbursed for every monthly planning meeting. In some units, such meetings are regarded as a leadership responsibility for which staff should not receive compensation. Other units have worked out informal procedures by which some participants are reimbursed for some but not for every meeting. For instance, participants might be reimbursed for every second or third meeting, or enlisted personnel might be reimbursed for more (but probably not all) meetings and

officers personnel might be reimbursed for fewer meetings. The major finding, however, was that no one expressed concern over the lack of compensation for training meetings.

2. Actual Participation at Monthly Meetings

Army FM 25-101 identifies more than 12 company staff members who should attend monthly training meetings. More than twice that number of battalion staff members were identified for battalion training meetings. However, this requirement was designed with combat units in mind. The combat units we visited indicated that they try to have as many of those participants attend as possible. For CSS units, training meetings usually deal with routine issues that can be handled by a smaller group of appropriate personnel. In short, the actual number of personnel required to support monthly planning meetings is not as large as specified in Army documents.

The Army procedures obviously do not apply to Marine units. In fact, USMCR participants made it clear that unit training planning is the responsibility of a much smaller subset of unit staff, principally the commander and key inspector and instructor (I&I) staff members. Also, the USMCR respondents noted that the requirement for ATPs and RMPs is reduced to the extent that full-time personnel are involved in planning and preparation.

3. Use of Alternative Forms of Communication

The use of alternative forms of communication (telephones, faxes, e-mail, newsletters, web sites) reduces the need for face-to-face meetings. These alternate approaches provide efficient and effective methods for monitoring the accomplishment of last-minute training preparation details. These alternate approaches have proven particularly useful for staff members who live far from their armory. Comments from the USMCR and ARNG participants indicate that the units are actively promoting the use of computers and e-mail to conduct training business and are even providing key staff their own laptop computers for use at home. One ARNG leader described this initiative as a “virtual planning environment.” At the same time, USMCR participants noted that the increasing use of these methods would eventually require all Services to develop methods for reimbursing staff for work at home.

In addition to planning and preparation, one unit noted that newsletters and web sites provide appropriate media for presenting mandated nontechnical or nontactical information, such as personnel relations and policy announcements. This use of alternative media could potentially free up drill time for training technical and/or tactical issues.

4. Planning During Drills

Planning during drills for the present weekend was generally recognized as a particularly egregious example of poor training management. However, some ARNG and USAR participants noted that some units find it useful to plan for *future* drills at some point during a drill weekend because the principal staff members are all gathered together (and therefore do not have to travel to a central meeting point during the week).

One recommended approach was to hold such planning meetings on Sunday afternoons or evenings after the conclusion of the drill, so that ongoing training activities are not interrupted. Participants indicated that staff members are often willing to forgo compensation if such meetings are conducted and concluded expeditiously. However, one group of USAR participants noted that this approach is impractical because unit staff are too tired to hold an additional meeting after completing intensive drill weekends. Another ARNG unit indicated that this approach, while it may work for companies, is not practical for battalion planning. Getting slice elements to attend on battalion IDT weekends when they may not be scheduled for a drill is impossible.

Thus, while some elements have found that planning during IDT weekends is a useful approach, it does not work for all units.

III. OBSERVATIONS AND COMMENTS

A. LEADERSHIP

Individual and group discussions affirmed that many Army RC units have problems with training planning and preparation. Explicitly and implicitly, the underlying cause was ascribed to shortcomings in leadership.³ Conversely, good leadership seemed to be correlated positively with successful training and preparation, even though pay for training management meetings was generally not available for companies and below.

Factors other than shortcomings in leadership also hinder training and training planning and preparation. In some areas, the manpower pool does not have the quality of personnel whom the RCs want to recruit. USAR recruiting is handicapped by the inability to match state educational benefits available for National Guardsmen. In large metropolitan areas, other employment and entertainment opportunities can hamper recruiting and retention. In addition, in some unmeasured way, reenlisting is discouraged by poor training facilities or equipment, lack of field training except during AT, and lack of experienced officers and NCOs available as teachers, mentors, or role models.

B. PROCESS

Army FM 25-101 prescribes face-to-face training management meetings and identifies those unit members who should attend. Presumably, the motive for such separate meetings is to gather all concerned with training planning and preparation in one place at one time to convey unit priorities and to imbue appropriate attitudes toward training and training management. Such information is often best communicated when verbal communication is augmented with nonverbal communication (e.g., facial expressions and body language) and appropriate social and organizational demands that are only possible in face-to-face meetings. The meetings are not to be held in conjunction with IDT periods. However, many units have meetings to plan and prepare for the next IDT period after the just-ended

³ Leadership refers not only unit commanders. It includes the AGRs and Marine I&Is, who are key players in planning and preparation for training.

IDT period. So, they do gain the nonverbal value of the separate training management meetings specified by FM 25-101. (We learned that a few Reserve units did not wait until the end of an IDT period to plan for the next month's IDT period.)

Since many RC units are widely dispersed, separate face-to-face training management meetings pose problems in getting together all those concerned with planning and preparation. Some unit leaders have to drive long distances. Thus, RC units use often e-mail, telephone, fax, and the unit newsletter to plan and prepare for their IDT periods. Moreover, Marine RC units consider face-to-face training meetings inefficient ways to plan and prepare for training. Those responsible for planning and preparing training are required to be computer literate and competent to communicate by e-mail, fax, or telephone. The Marine RC says this system expedites training management and saves travel time.

C. RESPONSIBILITY

Training is a commander's responsibility—for his own unit and for his subordinate units. From our discussions, we observed that face-to-face meetings of commanders and their next lower level unit commanders are unusual. However, such meetings would be a good way to obtain the nonverbal value of the more widely attended training management meetings desired by FM 25-101. These one-on-one meetings, which are not substitutes for the FM 25-101 meetings, would focus primarily on motivation for training planning and preparation: keeping troops busy with meaningful, interactive training throughout the IDT period, making the troops feel they are learning, and getting the AGR to shoulder the training planning and preparation load as (many report) the I&I Marines do. The troops want challenging training and are willing to work hard when they sense self-improvement. The commander must motivate his subordinate commanders to make training successful by paying a lot of attention to training planning and preparation.

Not all of the shortcomings in RC training can be blamed on the RC units. Training management suffers because some commanders are preoccupied with recruiting. Also, the policy of high DoD management level(s)—presumably above the RCs themselves—that values the number of bodies more than personnel competence handicaps the RCs in training planning and preparation. Another consequence of the numbers-over-competence policy is an imposed RC unit tolerance of poor performance by those responsible for training planning and preparation. Separation of those who cannot or will not do their jobs satisfactorily should induce better performance by everyone involved with training management.

We conclude with the following general observation: The concern expressed most often during our USAR and ARNG discussions was frustration over the unavailability of tools to conduct effective training (e.g., lack of opportunities for hands-on training in the field in IDT periods; lack of challenging, interactive TADSS; and lack of personnel who have current or recent Active Army experience). Surely, in many cases, that frustration must stifle motivation for conducting aggressive training planning and preparation. The responsibility for ensuring that such tools are available lies with DoD management far above the RC unit level.

IV. RECOMMENDATIONS

Our observations lead to the recommendations listed below. These recommendations are aimed primarily at the AR but, in some cases, would also benefit the ARNG and the Marine Forces Reserve (MARFORRES). They involve increased spending, changes in policy, and long, persistent effort.

- Increase the availability of electronic training courseware (e.g., web-based or CD-based training programs) and other training tools during IDT weekends. Unit commanders are handicapped in their efforts to manage training if they do not have state-of-the-art tools for conducting training.
- Encourage the use of available communications technology for training planning and preparation, realizing, however, that face-to-face meetings to plan and prepare unit training have real benefits. The point is that the use of modern communications (e.g., e-mail, faxes, telephones) can make the training management more efficient. These should be complementary, not competitive, approaches for USAR and ARNG units.
- Increase full-time staffing of many USAR units. One severe impediment to USAR training management is the severe shortages of full-time staff. These personnel are key players in both planning and preparing for weekend drills. In fact, several respondents suggested that whatever funds would support more ATPs or RMPs should be shifted to increase full-time staffing.
- Shift funds that would support more additional training periods (ATPs) or readiness management periods (RMPs) to increase full-time staffing. Substantial increases in ATPs/RMPs are not required to support training management. Participants at high-level (battalion and above) training planning and preparation meetings are generally paid travel and per diem. Funds are generally not available to pay participants at small-unit (company) meetings to plan and prepare training. This long-standing practice has inured low-level training personnel not to expect to be paid for their planning meetings.
- Reduce micro-management of small-unit (i.e., company) training. Having detailed written procedures for every aspect of training discourages junior leaders' use of their own intelligence and initiative to manage unit training.
- Reevaluate policies that value unit strength over training and performance. The high-level DoD policy that emphasizes numbers of bodies more than personnel

competence handicaps some RC units, which must tolerate poor performance by those involved in planning and preparing training. The overemphasis of unit strength also diverts commanders' attention away from training management issues and toward attaining and maintaining unit strength.

REFERENCES

- Cragin, C.L. (2000, June). Subject: Request for increased training management assemblies [Memorandum for Assistant Secretary of the Army (M&RA)]. Washington, DC: Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense.
- Department of Defense (1997, March). *Uniform reserve, training and retirement category administration* (Department of Defense Instruction 1215.19). Washington, DC: Author.
- Department of Defense (2000, December). *Uniform reserve, training and retirement category administration* (Department of Defense Instruction 1215.19). Washington, DC: Author.
- Department of the Army (1988, November). *Training the force* (FM 25-100). Washington, DC: Author.
- Department of the Army (1990, September). *Battle-focused training* (FM 25-101). Washington, DC: Author.
- Department of the Navy (1996, November). *Unit training management guide* (MCRP 3-0A). Washington, DC: Headquarters, United States Marine Corps.
- Department of the Navy (1996, November). *How to conduct training* (MCRP 3-0B). Washington, DC: Headquarters, United States Marine Corps.

GLOSSARY

AC	Active Component
ADSW	Active Duty for Special/Support Work
AFR	Air Force Reserve
AGR	Active Guard and Reserve
AIT	advanced individual training
ANG	Air National Guard
ARNG	Army National Guard
AT	annual training
ATP	additional training period
BCBST	brigade command and battle staff training
BTMS	Battalion Training Management System
CAAP	Command Assistance Assessment Program
CAX	combined arms exercises
CINC	Commander in Chief
COSCOM	Corps Support Command
CS	combat support
CSS	combat service support
DA	Department of the Army
DMOS	duty military occupational skill
DMOSQ	duty military occupational skill qualification
DoD	Department of Defense
DoDI	Department of Defense Instruction

DRU	Direct Reporting Unit
ECS	Equipment Concentration Site
EEO	equal employment opportunity
eSB	enhanced separate brigades
FM	field manual
FORSCOM	United States Army Forces Command
FSP	Force Support Package
FSSG	Force Service Support Group
HQ	headquarters
I&I	inspector and instructor
IDIV	Interim Division
IDT	inactive duty training
IOBC	Infantry Officer Basic Course
IRR	Inactive Ready Reserve
JRTC	Joint Readiness Training Center
M&RA	Manpower and Reserve Affairs
MACOM	Major Command
MARFORRES	Marine Forces Reserve
MATES	Mobilization and Training Equipment Site
MCCRES	Marine Corps Combat Readiness Evaluation System
MCRP	Marine Corps Reference Publication
MDMP	military decision-making process
METL	mission essential task list
MILES	Multiple Integrated Laser Engagement System
MOS	military occupational specialty
MOSQ	military occupation skill qualification

MP	Military Police
MSC	Major Subordinate Command
MSE	Major Subordinate Element
MTW	major theater warfare
MUTA	Multiple Unit Training Assembly
NAVRES	Navy Reserve
NCO	non-commissioned officer
NGB	National Guard Bureau
NTC	National Training Center
OCS	Officer Candidate School
OJT	on-the-job training
OPTEMPO	Operations Tempo
OSD	Office of the Secretary of Defense
R2	recruiting and retention
RC	Reserve Component
RMP	readiness management period
ROTC	Reserve Officer Training Corps
RSC	Regional Support Command
SATS	Standard Army Training System
SORTS	Status of Resources and Training System
SOP	standard operating procedure
SP	Support Package
STARC	State Area Command
TAM	Training Assessment Model
TDA	Table of Distribution and Allowance
TADSS	training aids, devices, simulators, and simulations

TRADOC	Training and Doctrine Command
TSB	Training Support Brigade
TSBN	Training Support Battalion
USA	United States Army
USAR	United States Army Reserve
USARC	United States Army Reserve Command
USMCR	United States Marine Corps Reserve
YTB	yearly training brief
YTP	yearly training program

APPENDIX A
PROTOCOL FOR CONDUCTING DISCUSSIONS

APPENDIX A

PROTOCOL FOR CONDUCTING DISCUSSIONS

The following questions were used as a general guide to stimulate discussion during the discussions of Reserve Component (RC) organizations. The questions were divided into three categories:

- First, we want to collect some statistics related to the ability of your organization to monitor training of subordinate units.
 - How many units [combat, combat support (CS), and combat service support (CSS)] do you oversee?
 - How many CSS units do you oversee?
 - How large is your training staff?
 - How many CSS units is your staff able to visit in a year to observe training?
 - How many CSS units is your staff able to visit in a year to review/assess training management?
 - Do you have a training management standard operating procedure (SOP)? Can we have a copy?
 - Can we have an organization chart/wiring diagram of units?
- Second, we have some questions about unit training in your organization.
 - What impact, if any, does availability/nonavailability of training resources (e.g., equipment, qualified leaders, training areas/facilities/devices, strategies, and funds) have on training management and planning?
 - How does unit locale (e.g., large, medium, or small urban area) affect training and training management?
 - What means (e.g., meetings, telephone, e-mail, fax) are used for training planning?
 - How frequently are training planning meetings held?

- Who usually attends these meetings?
- What are the hallmarks of good training management?
- Third, we have some more detailed questions related to unit training.
 - How many units are in SP-1, SP-2, SP-3, SP-4, and SP-5? (**Editor's Note:** *SP = Support Package*)
 - Are we correct in assuming that more attention is paid to higher-priority SP units than to other units?
 - Is training state/training readiness a surrogate for quality of training management?
 - How frequently is training planning for an inactive duty training (IDT) weekend done during the initial Saturday hours of the training period?
 - Are visits to units often conducted on IDT weekends?
 - If YES, are the visits usually done with prior notification?
 - Does the United States Army Reserve Command (USARC) have an evaluation system equivalent to the Army National Guard (ARNG) training assessment model?
 - How much is computer-based courseware used for training?
 - How available are computers?
 - How much hands-on training is available for mechanics, truck drivers, corporals, and others who need to develop and/or maintain psychomotor skills?
 - What do units need more of (e.g., actual equipment; simulators; computers and computer-based courseware; access to field training; officers and NCOs with active duty experience; interaction with Active Army personnel, and so forth)?
 - What percentage of training time is devoted to tactical activities compared with nontactical activities and briefings?
 - How much joint training is done with other Reserve combat units or other units in IDT? At annual training (AT)?
 - Is there an automated system to track transactions and events (e.g., attendance, training credits, pay, administrative matters and so forth) involving individual soldiers to provide a conveniently accessible record that anyone with a need-to-know can use?

APPENDIX B
ADDITIONAL COMMENTS OF DISCUSSION PARTICIPANTS

APPENDIX B

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS OF DISCUSSION PARTICIPANTS

Tables B-1, B-2, and B-3 provide additional comments about training management issues.

**Table B-1. Additional Comments Provided by Participants
From the United States Army Reserve (USAR)**

- To practice medicine during IDT [inactive duty training] or AT [annual training], RSC [Regional Support Command] medical doctors and nurses must apply to and be approved by the state in which they will practice. The Navy and Air Force have computer processes that quickly obtain credential approval; however, the USARC [United States Army Reserve Command] has no such computerized system, so credentialing takes much longer.
- Despite the many negative observations, the RSC believes that the USAR [United States Army Reserve] training situation is better today than it was 20 years ago.
- Computers are available for training but are not used much. A Distance Learning Center is available in the RSC Headquarters (HQ) building but is not used because courseware is not available.
- The Engineer Battalion located upstate was cited as a consistently well-trained unit.
- The RSC's Support Group, 13 of whose 29 units are FSP [Force Support Package], is having an especially busy year. Although its mission and METL [mission essential task list] are specified by its War Trace unit (the 311th COSCOM [Corps Support Command]), the Support Group staff oversees the training and does pre-CAAP [Command Assistance Assessment Program] inspection of FSP units. The short-handed staff itself has been training for an NTC [National Training Center] rotation.
- Effective training in the RSC is inhibited by the fact that there is not enough interaction with Active Army units.
- Effective training in the RSC is inhibited by the fact that fewer and fewer reservists have had Active Army service experience.
- Because of the lack of interaction with the Active Army and the shortage of Active Army experience in the Reserve, most reservists do not see a connection between their efforts and the Army of combined arms. Also, they don't see the coordination and synchronization of the many disparate skills of individuals and collectives that are needed for combat effectiveness.
- Until about 3 months ago, RSC training staff members visited about 30 units per year. These were announced visits to observe training.
- TAM [Training Assessment Model] reports are submitted by about one half of the USAR reporting units in the RSC. Ratings are done by the unit commanders and by 78th Division officers who observe AT.
- CAAP teams from the Readiness Command observe and assess Tier I unit training every 3 years. Their reports go to the Readiness Command and to the RSC G-3.
- The RSC staff attends YTBs (yearly training briefs) at the MSCs (Major Subordinate Commands), and, in turn, the 11 MSCs and 9 DRUs (Direct Reporting Units) observe unit-level training. CAAP teams conduct external evaluations of Tier 1 units.
- The RSC staff conducts Organizational Inspection Program visits annually to the MSCs and DRUs.

**Table B-1. Additional Comments Provided by Participants
From the United States Army Reserve (USAR) (Continued)**

- At higher levels, RSC training meetings are held weekly. AT council meetings are held quarterly until April and weekly thereafter. MSC battalions and companies hold monthly training planning meetings.
- An interesting response to our question about how the training staff recognizes a unit with good training management: the unit that's always asking for support.
- The RSC training staff visits 12 to 15 non-FSP units annually. These training/assessment visits are made with notification. The FSP units are inspected by CAAP teams. Seventy-five percent of these visits result in favorable reviews, for which the RSC has a form for written assessments.
- At the RSC level, training synchronization meetings are done by telephone twice a month for the MSCs, DRUs, and battalions to pass information and to discuss issues. These telephone exchanges follow unpaid Wednesday night meetings (two-per-month) that cover administrative matters and planning/resourcing for training at the RSC/MSC level.
- The RSC has 71 Tier 1A units and 60 FSP units. Some non-FSP units are resourced as Tier 1A units because they have a tradition of high levels of readiness and the RSC wants to maintain that readiness in case of a CINC [Commander in Chief] requirement materializes.
- TAM reports are submitted annually for FSP units. Other units submit TAM reports every 3 years.
- The RSC has six multiple-component units, which are commanded by either a Reserve officer or an Active Army officer.
- The MSEs allocate funds to subordinate battalions for ATP/RMP [additional training period/readiness management period] and monitor down to the company level.
- Training staff includes 7 full-time members and 25 part-time reservists who spend 2 days/month at HQ. RSC has 13 percent of its required strength in full-time AGRs [Active Guard and Reserves].
- Training staff has 7 full-time and 7 part-time personnel who oversee individual training and 5 full-time and 14 part-time personnel who oversee unit training.
- Training staff has 15 slots, 12 of which are presently filled with 6 AGRs and 6 part-time reservists. Company-level staffs in the MSCs generally have three AGRs (supply, operations, and maintenance).
- Training staff has 11 full-time and 27 part-time personnel. Seven function as a field training and evaluation team that visits 30–50 units per year in the Maryland, District of Columbia, and Northern Virginia area. For units in the rest of the territory, visits to monitor field training are made by the MSCs, which are sometimes accompanied by members of the RSC Training staff. Most visits on IDT weekends are made with 72 hours or more of notification. However, the RSC does make unannounced visits.

**Table B-2. Additional Comments Provided by Participants
From the Army National Guard (ARNG)**

- Tiered readiness needs to be modified to reflect the reality that eSBs [enhanced separate brigades] are going to the NTC and they need a higher level of resourcing for that year before the rotation. The IDIV [Interim Division] can't do much about this. It has to come from DoD [Department of Defense] and NGB [National Guard Bureau].
- The division is resourced at a higher level than it was 3 to 4 years ago. There are fewer complaints about funding.
- The Guard is guilty of allowing brigadier generals to command brigades even those these people are not familiar with what that brigade does. Examples were cited where aviation and engineer officers promoted to brigadier general and put in command of an armored brigade because they were put on that promotion track years earlier.
- Hard decisions in the Guard can be made, despite political pressure. As an example, a Massachusetts engineer battalion was ordered to AT in Honduras about 15 years ago. When the state refused to deploy the battalion, federal funds were withheld, and the federal equipment of the unit was ordered not to be used. The Massachusetts governor soon relented, and the battalion was deployed.
- A staff member provided a local example of the effects of politics. The command position of an Engineer Battalion is always filled from within the battalion. Once, a division commander tried to fill the position with someone who had not been vetted by either the unit members or the local political leaders. In a matter of a few days, the newly assigned colonel was removed, and a new (local fellow) commander was installed.
- Staff member gave the example of senior NCOs [non-commissioned officers] who are fed up with trivial matters in the RC [Reserve Component], citing two master sergeants who came to drill in civilian clothes after they had received their "20-year letter," and tendered their resignations that day.
- Both the Guard and AC have problems in MDMP (military decision-making process).
- Company commanders are overburdened.
- Loopholes in the federal law allow employers to fire Guard members who go overseas.
- "Ghosts" are soldiers who are recruited and sometime after basic and AIT [advanced individual training] decide that they no longer want to be part of the Guard and simply stop showing up for drill. Rather than pursue disciplinary action (court martial, Article 15), the commanders tend to initiate separation procedures. It is estimated that there are about 30,000 such ghosts in the RC (Guard and USAR).
- A part-time Guard lieutenant colonel gets about \$17,000 a year. Rhetorical question: "And what do the tax payers get for that money?" A big concern is what staff officers and NCOs do on IDT weekends. Not much, or at least not what they should be doing. Staff member asserts: "They should be conducting command and staff training and becoming more proficient in MDMP."
- Training Support XXI plus the integrated divisions allows forces to focus on training management.
- When asked what additional resources he could use, the general said, "Time. We need more time."
- The 30th Brigade is going to focus on maneuver training at the expense of gunnery to do well and be trained at a higher level than platoon at NTC. They "will be the best brigade through the NTC yet."

**Table B-2. Additional Comments Provided by Participants
From the Army National Guard (ARNG) (Continued)**

- Training management happens at all levels. It is different at higher levels than at lower ones. For example, managing brigade training cycles (NTC rotations) is training management at the higher levels.
- There is a problem in the funding chain that goes from NGB to the state HQ and then filters down to the divisions/brigades. "Money that funds federal missions ought to go from the U.S. Army directly to the Guard unit that trains to perform those missions, not through the STARCs [state area commands]. The Guard needs a structure that enforces discipline and readiness."
- There is a need to get SATS (Standard Army Training System) working.
- METLs and task crosswalks need to be standardized for like units. Training events should be tied to funding.
- Training should be event driven rather than time driven. "We need to go back to the building block approach. Mastery of skills at one level before moving on to the next is important."
- "FORSCOM [United States Army Forces Command] Regulation 350-2 requires more than we can do." Gunnery should be done one year and maneuver the next. Consider other innovations (e.g., extending the training cycle to 15 or 18 months or splitting the single AT period into as many as three separate ATs). Note that others disagree with the latter, citing the increased time to prepare and recover from split ATs.
- Two of the brigade's tank companies qualified in gunnery without going through Tank Table V, which is a machine gun table. The idea is that gunnery qualification can happen without going through all the prescribed procedures.
- Maneuver should be emphasized over gunnery because maneuver is more difficult.
- BCBST (brigade command and battle staff training) can be the funding model for delivery of management training to Guard company and battalion members.
- Training tasks should be spread out over a longer cycle. The year is an artificial construct.
- Training Support XXI is the "best thing since MILES [Multiple Integrated Laser Engagement System]."
- RC units bite off too much and then become overwhelmed when they try to plan, resource, and execute.
- The ARNG [Army National Guard] flow of funds is parallel to the AC [Active Component]. In the AC, it starts at the MACOM [Major Command], then to the installation, and then to the command. For the ARNG, it starts at NGB (the MACOM), then to the STARCs (the analogue of installations), and then to the command.
- One indication of good training management is good money management.

**Table B-3. Additional Comments Provided by Participants
From the United States Marine Corps Reserve (USMCR)**

- The group (and associated reserve division) has 5-year plans that identify major exercises in which they will participate. Tentative scheduling is worked out 18 months (sometimes as many as 24) months before the exercise. The tentative schedule with any changes becomes final at the beginning of each fiscal year.
- The Support Group Commander and Command Sergeant Major regularly visit and inspect battalions and companies. So does the G-3. The inspector team makes unannounced inspections.

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE				Form Approved OMB No. 0704-0188	
Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 1 hour per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing this collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden to Department of Defense, Washington Headquarters Services, Directorate for Information Operations and Reports (0704-0188), 1215 Jefferson Davis Highway, Suite 1204, Arlington, VA 22202-4302. Respondents should be aware that notwithstanding any other provision of law, no person shall be subject to any penalty for failing to comply with a collection of information if it does not display a currently valid OMB control number. PLEASE DO NOT RETURN YOUR FORM TO THE ABOVE ADDRESS.					
1. REPORT DATE April 2002		2. REPORT TYPE Final		3. DATES COVERED (From-To) May 2000-February 2002	
4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE Planning and Preparing for Training in Reserve Component Units				5a. CONTRACT NUMBER DAS W01 98 C 0067	
				5b. GRANT NUMBER	
				5c. PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER	
6. AUTHOR(S) John E. Morrison, John Metzko, Charles Hawkins				5d. PROJECT NUMBER	
				5e. TASK NUMBER BE-2-1748	
				5f. WORK UNIT NUMBER	
7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) Institute for Defense Analyses 4850 Mark Center Drive Alexandria, VA 22311-1882				8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER I DA Document D-2700	
9. SPONSORING / MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Reserve Affairs [OASD/RA (RTM)] 1000 Defense, Pentagon, Room 2E191 Washington, DC 20301-1000				10. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S ACRONYM(S)	
				11. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S REPORT NUMBER(S)	
12. DISTRIBUTION / AVAILABILITY STATEMENT Approved for Public Release; unlimited distribution.					
13. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES					
14. ABSTRACT Anecdotal reports have indicated that weekend drill training events are often delayed or disorganized, leading some to believe that unit commanders and their staffs are ineffective in planning and preparing for weekend training. The present research sought to document the extent of this problem and to identify causes and possible solutions. Efforts were focused on a set of units that the authors felt had the most serious training management problems: combat service (CS) and combat service support (CSS) ground units in the Army National Guard (ARNG), the Army Reserve (AR), and the Marine Corps Reserve (MCR). Although a review of Service publications indicated that doctrine and procedures regarding training and planning did not differ substantially between the Army and the Marines, the interviews of RC personnel and other involved in RC training revealed several problems that need to be addressed [e.g., recruiting and retention (R2) practices, scant knowledge of training management practices, and lack of proper resources]. MCR units experienced fewer problems than the Army units, and the authors concluded that the involvement of a full-time inspector and instructor (I&I) in all aspects of training planning and preparation was the likely reason.					
15. SUBJECT TERMS Inactive duty training, Reserve components, training, training management, training planning, training preparation					
16. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF:			17. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT SAR	18. NUMBER OF PAGES 56	19a. NAME OF RESPONSIBLE PERSON COL Brarry A. Cox
a. REPORT Uncl.	b. ABSTRACT Uncl.	c. THIS PAGE Uncl.			19b. TELEPHONE NUMBER (include area code) 703-693-8611

