



**THE FUTURE ROLE OF THE JOINT DEPLOYMENT TRAINING CENTER  
IN THE EDUCATION AND TRAINING OF THE  
“JOINT DEPLOYMENT PROCESS”  
AT INTERMEDIATE AND SENIOR SERVICE SCHOOLS  
GRADUATE RESEARCH PROJECT**

Ron L. Sperling, Major, USAF  
AFIT/GMO/ENS/03E-12

**DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE  
AIR UNIVERSITY**

**AIR FORCE INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY**

---

---

**Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Ohio**

APPROVED FOR PUBLIC RELEASE; DISTRIBUTION UNLIMITED

The views expressed in this graduate research project are those of the author and do not reflect the official policy or position of the United States Air Force, Department of Defense, or the U.S. Government.

AFIT/GMO/ENS/03E-12

THE FUTURE ROLE OF THE JOINT DEPLOYMENT TRAINING CENTER  
IN THE EDUCATION AND TRAINING OF THE  
“JOINT DEPLOYMENT PROCESS”  
AT INTERMEDIATE AND SENIOR SERVICE SCHOOLS

GRADUATE RESEARCH PROJECT

Presented to the Faculty

Department of Operational Sciences

Graduate School of Engineering and Management

Air Force Institute of Technology

Air University

Air Education and Training Command

In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the

Degree of Masters in Air Mobility

Ron L. Sperling, B.S, MBA, ME.

Major, USAF

June 2003

APPROVED FOR PUBLIC RELEASE; DISTRIBUTION UNLIMITED

AFIT/GMO/ENS/03E-12

THE FUTURE ROLE OF THE JOINT DEPLOYMENT TRAINING CENTER  
IN THE EDUCATION AND TRAINING OF THE  
“JOINT DEPLOYMENT PROCESS”  
AT INTERMEDIATE AND SENIOR SERVICE SCHOOLS

Ron L. Sperling, B.S, MBA, ME.  
Major, USAF

Approved:

\_\_\_\_\_  
William A. Cunningham, Ph.D., (Advisor)

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

## Acknowledgments

I would like to express my sincere appreciation to my faculty advisor, William A. Cunningham, for his guidance and support with my Graduate Research Project. His experience, knowledge, and no-nonsense approach provided the direction I needed to complete this research project. I would also like to thank my sponsor, Col Daniel Steadman for the support he and Lt Col Thomas Jett and Maj Mike Spangler of the Joint Deployment Training Center have provided me.

Finally, I would like to thank my wife for her infinite patience and support and my son for his unqualified love.

Ron L. Sperling

## Table of Contents

<b><u>ACKNOWLEDGMENTS</u></b> .....	<b>IV</b>
<b><u>LIST OF FIGURES</u></b> .....	<b>VII</b>
<b><u>LIST OF TABLES</u></b> .....	<b>ERROR! BOOKMARK NOT DEFINED.</b>
<b>AFIT/GMO/ENS/03E-12</b> .....	<b>VIII</b>
<b><u>ABSTRACT</u></b> .....	<b>VIII</b>
<b>I. INTRODUCTION</b> .....	<b>1</b>
BACKGROUND .....	1
PROBLEM STATEMENT .....	2
RESEARCH OBJECTIVES .....	3
<b>II. LITERATURE REVIEW</b> .....	<b>4</b>
OVERVIEW .....	4
HISTORY OF THE JOINT DEPLOYMENT TRAINING CENTER .....	4
MISSION AND VISION OF THE JOINT DEPLOYMENT TRAINING CENTER .....	5
JOINT DEPLOYMENT SEMINAR COURSE .....	6
JOPEs ACTION OFFICER COURSE .....	9
EDUCATION VERSUS TRAINING .....	12
MISSION, AND FOCUS OF THE PROFESSIONAL MILITARY EDUCATION INSTITUTIONS .....	13
<b>III. METHODOLOGY</b> .....	<b>16</b>
RESEARCH DESIGN .....	16
THREATS .....	17
<b>IV. DATA DESCRIPTION AND ANALYSIS</b> .....	<b>18</b>
OVERVIEW .....	18
RESPONDENT DEMOGRAPHICS .....	18
THE QUESTIONNAIRE .....	18
<b>V. FINDINGS AND CONCLUSION</b> .....	<b>30</b>
IS THE TRAINING AND EDUCATION OFFERED BY PME INSTITUTIONS ADEQUATE TO PREPARE FUTURE ACTION OFFICERS FOR THEIR ROLES IN THE JOINT DEPLOYMENT OF MILITARY FORCES? .....	30
IS THE LACK OF TRAINING AT THE SERVICE PME INSTITUTIONS ACCEPTABLE .....	30
ALTERNATIVES TO LINKING THE JDTC WITH THE WARFIGHTERS .....	31
ALTERNATIVE 1: JDTC DEVELOP CURRICULA FOR PME COLLEGES .....	31
ALTERNATIVE 2: MOBILE TRAINING TEAMS .....	32
ALTERNATIVE 3: USJFCOM ABSORB THE JDTC .....	33

ALTERNATIVE 4: MAKE PLANS A CAREER FIELD .....	33
FINDINGS: THE PROPOSAL, ALTERNATIVE 5 .....	34
LIMITATIONS AND CONCLUSION .....	35
<b><u>APPENDIX A: SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE</u></b> .....	<b>36</b>
<b><u>APPENDIX B: SUMMARY OF RESPONSES</u></b> .....	<b>42</b>
<b><u>APPENDIX C: COMPENDIUM OF ACRONYMS USED</u></b> .....	<b>44</b>
<b>BIBLIOGRAPHY</b> .....	<b>46</b>
<b><u>VITA</u></b> .....	<b>48</b>

## List of Figures

Figure 1. JDTC Vision (JDTC Website, 2003:np) .....	6
Figure 2. Joint Deployment Process Phases, .....	9
Figure 3. Officer Military Education Framework (CJCSI 1800.01A, 2000:A-B-A-1) ...	15
Figure 4. Bar Chart for Responses to Question 1 .....	20
Figure 5. Bar Chart for Responses to Question 2 .....	20
Figure 6. Bar Chart for Responses to Question 3 .....	21
Figure 7. Bar Chart for Responses to Question 4 .....	21
Figure 8. Bar Chart for Responses to Question 5 .....	22
Figure 9. Bar Chart for Responses to Question 6 .....	22
Figure 10. Bar Chart for Responses to Question 7 .....	23
Figure 11. Bar Chart for Responses to Question 8 .....	23
Figure 12. Bar Chart for Responses to Question 9 .....	24
Figure 13. Bar Chart for Responses to Question 10 .....	24
Figure 14. Bar Chart for Responses to Question 11 .....	25
Figure 15. Bar Chart for Responses to Question 12 .....	26
Figure 16. Bar Chart for Responses to Question 13 .....	26
Figure 17. Bar Chart for Responses to Question 14 .....	26
Figure 18. Bar Chart for Responses to Question 15 .....	27
Figure 19. Bar Chart for Responses to Question 16 .....	28
Figure 20. Bar Chart for Responses to Question 17 .....	28
Figure 21. Bar Chart for Responses to Question 18 .....	29

**Abstract**

Two of the pillars that our National Military Strategy relies upon are the concepts of Strategic Agility and Power Projection. In light of DoD's transformation efforts, its current war on terrorism and war with Iraq, growing tensions between the United States and North Korea, and finite strategic lift capability, operational and strategic level military and civilian planners and decision makers must have an in-depth knowledge of the Joint Deployment Process. This knowledge will allow them to effectively and efficiently plan and execute the deployment of U.S. forces. (Joint Deployment Training Center: 2002)

This project explored the Joint Deployment Process as it is taught by the Joint Deployment Training Center at Ft Eustis, VA. A baseline of joint deployment training was established and Intermediate and Senior Service School Officials were surveyed to assess the level of training and education provided by their respective institutions on the Joint Deployment Process.

The research results indicate there is a lack of hands-on training of the Joint Deployment Process curricula (Joint Publication 3-35 and CJCSM 3122 series) at PME institutions. This can most likely be explained by the current mission of the PME institutions. Currently, PME institutions focus on education with some limited training also being accomplished. One recommendation would be to shift the emphasis from a pure education approach to that of one of education *and* training. This project recommends several ways in which the Joint Deployment Training Center can get its training to the

future action officers (the very same graduates of PME institutions) responsible of joint deployment.

THE FUTURE ROLE OF THE JOINT DEPLOYMENT TRAINING CENTER  
IN THE EDUCATION AND TRAINING OF THE  
“JOINT DEPLOYMENT PROCESS”  
AT INTERMEDIATE AND SENIOR SERVICE SCHOOLS

**I. Introduction**

**Background**

Since the end of the Cold War, the Department of Defense has made significant reductions in personnel and resources. Part of this reduction includes severe reductions of U.S. Forces permanently based in Europe. Because of this reduction, U.S. Forces are now expeditionary in nature. This is a major change in the way the United States’ military has operated. Additionally, U.S. Forces are more “Purple” than ever. U.S. Forces have been tasked to do more with less. This means most military endeavors will be conducted jointly. This includes deployment of military forces. The USJFCOM led quick-look ONE/OEF Joint Deployment Process Improvement (JDPI) Focus Team Conference, 27-28 Nov 01 and the Joint Deployment Conference, 6-8 Mar 02 attendees identified education and training as an area requiring attention in the overall effort to make the JDP more effective and efficient. (Joint Deployment Training Center, 2002) Currently, the action officer shows up at a unified command with little or no JDP *training*. Unfortunately, the deployment of the military does not stop. What often

happens is the action officer is left to learn the job on-the-job. This causes many problems, which include inefficient use of mobility resources to move people and metal.

### **Problem Statement**

Is the training and education offered by PME institutions adequate to prepare future action officers for their roles in the joint deployment of military forces?

## Research Objectives

This paper will examine what is being taught with respect to the Joint Deployment Process to action officers by the Joint Deployment Training Center (JDTC) at Ft Eustis, VA. A questionnaire will be constructed from source material of the JDTC and will be sent to the PME institutions of the United States. From there, an analysis of the responses will determine if the Joint Deployment Process (JDP) is being taught at a level comparable to the JDTC which is at an adequate level to prepare future action officers for their next staff job. After a comparison of the responses to the JDTC baseline is made, it will be necessary to ask several questions:

1. Is there a need for the JDTC? If the PME institutions are teaching the JDP to a level that adequately prepares future action officers, redundancy issues will be discussed.
2. If it is determined that some or all of the PME institutions do not teach the JDP to the same level as the JDTC, is this an acceptable situation? The difference of education and training and the missions of the PME institutions will be examined.
3. If the instruction from the PME institutions is inadequate for this subject, what alternatives would link the experts at the JDTC and the PME institutions to better prepare future action officers?
4. What are the benefits and drawbacks of each alternative? Analysis of the alternatives allows insight into the most effective ways to train future action officers for wartime effectiveness.

## **II. Literature Review**

### **Overview**

In order to understand what the JDP is, it will be necessary to research and develop a baseline of an “acceptable training level” as taught at the Joint Deployment Training Center at Ft Eustis, VA (USTRANSCOM). In order to fully understand the JDTC, it will be necessary to look at its history, mission and vision and then to look specifically at two courses taught by the JDTC that are intended for action officers. These two courses are the JOPES Action Officer Course (JAOC) and the Joint Deployment Seminar Course. Additionally, the mission of PME institutions as stated by CJCSI 1800.01A, Officer Professional Military Education Policy, and the difference between education and training must also be examined.

### **History of the Joint Deployment Training Center**

The Joint Deployment Training Center is the result of the shifting in the national defense strategy from a strategy of forward-based forces to a post cold war strategy of a smaller Continental United States (CONUS)-based force. Because of this shift in strategy, there is much greater demand on the joint deployment process. Unfortunately, education and training of the action officer responsible for the deployment process has been limited.

“Professional military education and Service school joint deployment education and training task training is generally contained within larger education programs and courses. As a result, time constraints often limit joint deployment education and training to basic process overviews. Little training occurs on critical deployment thinking, planning, deployment decision-making skills, and information management using automated deployment planning tools such as JOPES.” (SAIC 1998:4)

The concept for the JDTC grew from an initiative jointly proposed by USTRANCOM, the Department of the Army, the Deputy Chief of Staff for Logistics, and the Army Transportation Center and School (USATC&C). The Joint Planning and Execution Community identified a need for an organization to coordinate and integrate joint deployment education and training. Prior to the establishment of the JDTC, No organization then existed to develop, conduct, standardize, and integrate joint deployment training, education, and doctrine. The JDTC was established at Fort Eustis, Virginia on 1 December 1997. (SAIC 1996)

### **Mission and Vision of the Joint Deployment Training Center**

According to the Joint Deployment Training Center's website, the mission of the JDTC is to:

“develop standardized Joint Deployment Process (JDP) curricula to educate and train the DoD and select government/non-governmental organizations, to participate in the development and review of Joint Deployment Doctrine, and to provide training support during contingency operations. These efforts will strengthen the focus on the JDP and increase the efficiency and effectiveness of personnel to plan and execute joint operations.” (JDTC Website, 2003: np)

Additionally, to their website, the Joint Deployment Training Center's vision is:

"to be the Department of Defense's "Center of Excellence" for the education and training of the Joint Deployment Process (JDP) with state of the art education facilities, technologies, and methods."  
(JDTC Website, 2003: np)

The Joint Deployment Training Center focuses on doctrinal education of the JDP and hands-on training of the tools used in the Joint Operational Planning and Execution System (JOPES). The doctrinal education for the action officer begins with two courses available on compact disc interactive media. These courses are the Joint Deployment Process Course and the Joint Deployment Overview Course. The Joint Deployment

Seminar Course is a course that is near completion and will be taught at the JDTC in the classroom. The action officer receives JOPES classroom training in the “JOPES Action Officer Course (JAOC). The JAOC teaches everything that is taught in the two distributed product learning courses as well as valuable hands-on training of the hardware and software responsible for the actual movement of troops and supplies. This course is a full week, 40-hour course. In addition to the in-house courses taught by the JDTC, the JDTC will send Mobile Training Teams (MTTs) on an as-requested basis to educate and train the JDP and JOPES on the road. As seen in Figure 1, the full spectrum of training and education offered by the JDTC is depicted.




Figure 1. JDTC Vision (JDTC Website, 2003:np)

This study will focus on what will be taught in the Joint Deployment Seminar Course and what is taught in the Joint Action Officer Course since these two courses target future and actual action officers.

**Joint Deployment Seminar Course**

The Joint Deployment Seminar course focuses on the education of the doctrine of the JDP. The majority of this course is derived from Joint Publication 3-35. This course's target audience is the O-3 through the O-6 staff officer. It also highlights some of the software and web-based tools available to use such as the Global Transportation Network (GTN) and Single Mobility Manager (SMS). This course is scheduled for 20 hours but is flexible and can be tailored to meet the needs of the audience. The Joint Deployment Seminar Course speaks specifically about the joint deployment process and its associated phases. According to the Joint Publication 3-35 and course documentation:

“Deployment operations involve four phases: predeployment activities; movement to and activities at port of embarkation (POE); movement to port of debarkation (POD); and joint reception, staging, onward movement, and integration (JRSOI) activities. These phases are the major deployment activities of a joint force. Planning for and execution of these phases is based primarily on mission requirements and the time available to accomplish the mission. The primary objective of deployment is to provide personnel, equipment, and materiel when and where required by the Joint Forces Commander's concept of operations. In terms of execution, movement requirements developed during deployment planning must be validated prior to deployment execution. Intertheater air, land, and sea transportation is then scheduled to support the approved concept of operations. Force tracking throughout the deployment process is necessary and made possible by the innovative and integrated use of command and control systems and information technology.” (Joint Pub 3-35, 1999: III-1)

The deployment process begins when planning is initiated for force projection operations. At unit level the process begins with Mission Analysis. The process is completed with the Integration of the Force at the prescribed place and time, ready to conduct operations.

The first stage of the deployment process, the Pre-deployment stage, includes those activities at the home station that are required to prepare the people and things for a deployment. A deployment can be as small as a single individual, or

as large as an entire fighter wing including all of the people and equipment required by the combatant commander.

The second stage of the deployment process, the movement of to the port of embarkation (POE), focuses on staging, marshalling, and loading individuals, units, equipment and supplies on designated transportation assets for movement to the port of debarkation (POD). The port of embarkation and the port of debarkation can either be an aerial or sea port.

The third step in the deployment process is the movement of individuals and equipment from the port of embarkation to the port of debarkation. The movement is typically done with organic assets under the control of USTRANSCOM to include Air Mobility Command airlift, and Military Sealift Command ships. However, commercial movement of equipment and individuals can be and is often used.

The forth and final phase of the deployment process is the Joint Reception, Staging, Onward Movement, and Integration (JRSOI). JRSOI is the critical link between deployment and employment of joint forces in the area of responsibility or joint operations area. This phase comprises the essential processes to transition arriving personnel, equipment and supplies into forces capable of meeting operational requirements.

Figure 2 summarized the Joint Deployment Process phases




Figure 2. Joint Deployment Process Phases, (Joint Deployment Overview Course, 2002)

### JOPES Action Officer Course

The JOPES Action Officer Course focuses on actual manipulation of data using computers and software. The course is considered training as well as education. According to the JOPES Action Officer Course training manual, decision makers must have an in-depth knowledge of the Joint Deployment Process. This knowledge will allow them to effectively and efficiently plan and execute the deployment of U.S. forces. The Joint Operation Planning and Execution System (JOPES) Action Officer Course (JAOC) will give the action officer the analytical and problem-solving skills necessary to effectively use the JOPES automated data systems. The graduates of the JAOC will be able to use their working knowledge of the various JOPES systems to write and enforce sound Time Phased Force Deployment Data (TPFDD) guidance, find and correct errors, make updates, perform all functions of the validate and movement process, and produce TPFDD-based decision support information. The graduate of JAOC will be expected to be able to ensure that the TPFDD serves the operational planner's needs.

The JAOC is more than a lecture or seminar course. The JAOC is a five-day course designed to give the student the opportunity to have a hands-on experience with JOPES software applications, and to practice the application of knowledge with practical exercises throughout the course. According to the JDTC website

The JAOC provides general functional training and procedural information on how to conduct joint operation planning and execution using JOPES in the Global Command and Control System (GCCS) environment. It allows students to role-play at various levels within the JPEC in deliberate, crisis action, and exercise planning environments. Students learn about force structure, system security, and database structure. They analyze and edit TPFDD guidance, then review, find, and correct errors in their own TPFDD (either a copy of a real-world command-provided candidate TPFDD or a JTO-developed training TPFDD) to assure an error-free TPFDD that complies with CINC/Component Concept of Operations. They evaluate the database for transportation feasibility, source it, and schedule units for deployment. They use JOPES reporting and retrieval tools to produce decision-support products. During the last day, students participate in a challenging end-of-course practical exercise. The course builds strong analytical skills and confidence in the students' ability to use JOPES tools and resources in accomplishing their tasks. The scope of the course includes lecture, discussion, demonstration, and hands-on use of current and evolving JOPES software. Course structure also allows for application against a customer-provided TPFDD, TPFDD LOI/Guidance, and related Newsgroup. (JDTC Website, 2003:np)

The course is broken down into nine lessons followed by a final practical exercise.

The nine lessons are as follows:

Lesson one is a review of national defense organizations, JOPES planning and execution processes, common terminology and concepts. This lesson should be a refresher as will normally be covered fairly quickly.

Lesson two covers what an Action Officer (AO) can expect in a joint planning environment. Additionally, it provides the AO with some handy tools, checklists, and exercises that can be taken back the work center that can be helpful in determining the correct number and type of personnel and equipment necessary in a time of crisis.

Lesson three familiarizes the student with the various JOPES Information Technology (IT) tools. The student will be taught how to log on to and navigate around the JOPES software tools and databases. Additionally, the student will be shown how to make a personal copy of the TPFDD for use during the JAOC.

Lesson four teaches the student how to break down and analyze the TPFDD Letter of Instruction (LOI). Additionally, the student is taught how to understand supplemental LOIs. The student is then given a chance to check a TPFDD for LOI compliance.

Lesson five gives the student a chance to edit a TPFDD based on the TPFDD LOI and supplement centered on realistic situations.

Lesson six the student uses JOPES IT tools to find and correct errors in a TPFDD during both crisis and deliberate planning.

Lesson seven discusses the process used for validation, scheduling, and movement of requirements in the execution of a military operation. Additionally, this lesson teaches the student all functions required in the validation of TPFDD records in execution and the use of the Force Validation Tool (FVT) in the validation and unlocking of the records in process.

Lesson eight discusses the importance of planning for the support of forces that will be deployed. The lesson explores the tools and methods used in support planning and for checking the TPFDD for transportation feasibility in the TPFDD Refinement Conference.

Lesson nine discusses the nature and sources of the Decision Support Information and the student is uses JOPES applications to do come force tracking and unit dual-tasking analysis.

After completion of the course, the graduates should be able to:

- Compare/contrast Deliberate, Crisis Action, and Exercise Planning.

- Demonstrate an understanding of TPFDD development and execution in a given JPEC environment.
- Analyze, collaborate on, and provide recommendations to a TPFDD LOI, TPFDD LOI Supplemental guidance, and/or other TPFDD guidance related to a specific Operation.
- Analyze an existing TPFDD against TPFDD guidance and make associated TPFDD corrections.
- Analyze and discuss TPFDD support planning topics and make associated TPFDD updates.
- Analyze and prioritize forces for movement within a constrained strategic lift environment and make associated TPFDD updates.
- Analyze and refine TPFDD Validation and Movement Scheduling requirements and make associated updates to the JOPES deployment database.
- Develop decision support outputs to analyze and brief TPFDD topics, to include TPFDD execution topics. (JAOC, 2003)

### **Education versus Training**

Education and training have similar definitions and the subtle differences between the two are important to note. Education is a process of building a knowledge base and the skills for further developing that knowledge base. Education often focuses on conceptual and historical knowledge. Training, on the other hand, focuses more on building the specific areas of knowledge, skills, or attitudes that directly influence a person's ability to perform a job, execute the task, or solve a problem. It focuses on gaining a skill like typing. (Limanauskiene, 2003) In an article by John Moore, the distinction is made.

“Training means a narrowly focused program that leads to high proficiency in a specific skill. It prepares a student for one particular job

or activity but provides neither broad perspective nor flexibility of approach. On the other hand, education enables students to see the forest *and* the trees. It encourages general approaches to problem solving and inculcates ways of thinking that are productive, effective, and rewarding. An education prepares a student to deal with and solve a broad range of problems, and to choose which problems are important and which are not. True education involves drawing out the innate qualities of students, helping them to develop their own understanding, and nourishing their minds to achieve the greatest possible stature. It is a difficult goal to achieve, but one that is well worth our best efforts.” (Moore, 1998:135)

For the purpose of this project, education focuses on teaching the what, who, where, and why of the JDP while training focuses on teaching the how of the JDP. Again, the difference is subtle. However, knowing about the JDP (the who, what, where, when) is different from knowing how to manipulate the JOPES hardware and software to actually move military people and machinery.

### **Mission, and Focus of the Professional Military Education Institutions**

The mission of the PME institution is different for intermediate and senior service school levels. The mission of the Intermediate Level College (ILC) “is to expand student understanding, from a Service component perspective, of joint force employment at the operational and tactical levels of war.” (CJCSI 1800.01A, 2000: E-B-1) The mission of the Senior Level College (SLC)

“is to prepare future military and civilian leaders for high-level policy, command, and staff responsibilities by educating them in the diplomatic, economic, military, and informational dimensions of the strategic security environment and the effect of those dimensions on strategy formulation, implementation, and campaigning. SLC subject matter is inherently joint; JPME at this level focuses on the development of joint attitudes and perspectives.” (CJCSI 1800.01A, 2000: E-C-1)

The focus of ILC and SLC are also different with the SLC building on the focus of the ILC.

“Intermediate-level education focuses on warfighting within the context of operational art. Students expand their understanding of joint force employment at the operational and tactical levels of war. They gain a better understanding of joint and Service perspectives. Inherent in this level is development of an officer’s analytic capabilities and creative thought processes. In addition to continuing development of their combined arms expertise, they are introduced to theater strategy and plans, national military strategy, and national security strategy and policy.” (CJCSI 1800.01A, 2000: E-B-1)

“Senior-level education focuses on strategy, and the art and science of developing and using instruments of national power (diplomatic, economic, military, and informational), as necessary, during peace and war to afford the maximum support to policies in order to increase the probabilities and favorable consequences of victory and to lessen the chances of defeat. Studies at these colleges should emphasize analysis, foster critical examination, encourage creativity, and provide a progressively broader educational experience.” (CJCSI 1800.01A, 2000: E-B-1)

Additionally, according to CJCSI 1800.01A, the joint learning areas and objectives of the *Joint Planning and Execution Processes* for the intermediate service schools are all knowledge level objectives. They are as follows:

- a. Through the framework provided by joint planning processes, ***explain*** the relationship between national objectives and means availability.
- b. ***Comprehend*** the effect of time, coordination, policy changes, and political developments on the planning process.
- c. ***Explain*** how defense planning systems affect joint operational planning.
- d. ***Comprehend*** how national, joint, and Service intelligence organizations support JFCs (Joint Force Commanders).
- e. ***Comprehend*** the fundamentals of campaign planning”. [emphasis added] (CJCSI 1800.01A, 2000:E-B-1)

Figure 3 captures the entire description of PME.

OFFICER MILITARY EDUCATION FRAMEWORK (Figure 1)					
GRADE	CADET/MIDSHIPMAN	0-10-20-3	0-30-4	0-50-6	0-70-8
EDUCATION LEVEL	PRE-COMMISSIONING	PRIMARY	INTERMEDIATE	SENIOR	GENERAL/FLAG
<b>EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS AND COURSES</b>	SERVICE ACADEMIES ROTC OCS/OTS	- Branch, Warfare, or Staff Specialty Schools  - Primary-Level PME Courses	- Air Command & Staff College - Army Command & General Staff College - College of Naval Command & Staff - Marine Corps Command & Staff College - Joint Forces Staff College <sup>3</sup> - Joint & Combined Staff Officer School	- Air War College - Army War College - College of Naval Warfare - Marine Corps War College - Industrial College of the Armed Forces <sup>2</sup> - National War College <sup>2</sup> - Joint Forces Staff College <sup>2</sup> - Joint & Combined Warfighting School	- CAPSTONE
<b>LEVELS OF WAR EMPHASIZED</b>	CONCEPTUAL AWARENESS OF ALL LEVELS				
<b>FOCUS OF MILITARY EDUCATION</b>	Introduction To Services' Missions	- Assigned Branch, Warfare, or Staff Specialty	- Warfighting within the context of Operational Art	- Service Schools: National Military Strategy - NCW: National Security Strategy - ICAF: National Security Strategy with emphasis on the Resource Components	- Joint Matters and National Security - Interagency Process - Multinational Operations
<b>JOINT EMPHASIS</b>	<u>Joint Introduction</u>  - National Military Capabilities and Organization - Foundation of Joint Warfare	<u>Joint Awareness</u>  - Joint Warfare Fundamentals - Joint Campaigning	<u>JPME Phase I</u>  - National Military Capabilities and Command Structure - Joint Doctrine - Joint and Multinational Forces at the Operational Level of War - Joint Planning and Execution Processes - Information Operations	<u>JPME Phase I</u>  - National Security Strategy - National Planning systems and Processes - National Military Strategy and Organization - Theater Strategy and Campaigning - The Role of Technology in 21 <sup>st</sup> Century Warfare	<u>Joint CAPSTONE</u>  - National Security Strategy - Joint Operational Art
			<u>JPME Phase II</u>  - National Security and Military Strategy in development of theater strategies - Theater Engagement and Campaign Planning with joint, multinational and interagency organizations - JSPS, JOPES and operational-level battlespace systems integration through deliberate and crisis planning		

Figure 3. Officer Military Education Framework (CJCSI 1800.01A, 2000:A-B-A-1)

### **III. Methodology**

#### **Research Design**

In order to determine what the intermediate and senior service schools are teaching with respect to the JDP, a questionnaire was developed using source documentation from two JDTC courses. The JDTC courses that target the action officer are the JOPES Action Officer Course (JAOC) and the Joint Deployment Process Course. Additionally, source material from a new course that is currently being developed, the Joint Deployment Seminar Course, was also used in the questionnaire development. This project considers the material derived from all three courses as the baseline of acceptable training and education. The questionnaire was sent to individuals within the service schools that were best suited to answer the questionnaire. The individuals volunteered to answer the questionnaire on behalf of their respective service school. Each individual is considered the expert about the JDP from each school. In order to get candid answers to the questionnaire, strict confidentiality was promised. The survey responses are not identified with the service school or the individual. The questionnaire was sent to the following institutions:

Air Command and Staff College, Maxwell AFB, AL

Air War College, Maxwell AFB, AL

Army Command and Staff College, Fort Leavenworth, KS

Army War College, Carlisle, PA

Marine Command and Staff College, Quantico, VA

Marine Corp War College, Quantico, VA

College of Naval Command and Staff, Newport, RI

Naval War College, Newport, RI

Joint Forces Staff College, Norfolk, VA

Two schools elected not to complete the questionnaire after review of the questionnaire.

No reason was given by either school.

The questionnaire for this project is included in Appendix A.

## **Threats**

Several threats existed in the design of this research. First, bias could have introduced error due to the fact that the researcher had to select the sample of respondents.

Additionally, only one individual from each service school was asked to represent their respective school. Also, the construction of the questionnaire could have also introduced bias. The questionnaire was constructed from source material from the Joint Deployment Training Center. Although it is their mission to train the deployment process, there is currently no definitive source for deployment training. Basing the questionnaire strictly on courses taught by the JDTC could have left key concepts out of the questionnaire that are in fact taught by the service schools. The use of a questionnaire also introduced a threat to construct validity. Special attention was paid when designing the questionnaire to ensure that format was easy to follow, and that items were worded clearly and their order did not affect responses.

A further significant threat to validity existed if the respondents did not feel their responses were to be kept confidential. The respondents were assured their responses would be kept confidential, but human nature might cause some respondents to exaggerate to what level the schools were teaching this particular subject. Since no stringent controls were imposed over the survey respondents, the only means of negating this threat was by instructing respondents to answer without fear of losing confidentiality.

When initially contacted for this study, respondents were promised strict confidentiality concerning the questionnaire.

This study will have little external validity, other than to highlight the need for both Joint Deployment Process training *and* education.

## **IV. Data Description and Analysis**

### **Overview**

Information for this study was gathered using quantitative data. Appendix A contains the entire Questionnaire. Please note that survey respondents are guaranteed anonymity.

### **Respondent Demographics**

Minimal demographic data is provided (to preserve anonymity) to portray the respondents of the questionnaire. All respondents of the questionnaire were either active duty or retired military and worked for their respective PME college in the department that teaches the JDP.

### **The Questionnaire**

The odd numbered questions 1 through 17 in Appendix A were used to measure the level of education and training of the JDP provided by the various service schools. The respondents were asked to indicate the level of education and training each service school provides on each particular topic. The respondents were given four choices with respect to if the subject is being taught by their particular service school. The range of choices is as follows:

1. Subject not taught at this institution at this time
2. Subject taught as part of an elective course
3. Subject partially taught as part of a required course
4. Subject completely taught as part of a required course

If the respondent indicated the service school in fact taught the subject highlighted in the odd numbered questions 1 through 17 (responding with 2, 3, or 4), the respondents were asked to provide the number of hours the institution dedicated to the subject in the following even numbered questions. Appendix B contains a spreadsheet with values for responses to all 18 questions.

Questions 1 and 2 measured the level the subject of JOPES (Joint Operations Planning and Execution System) Processes, Terms and Concepts is taught at the service schools. This topic is one of knowledge rather than a skill and would fall under education rather than training. Of the seven schools completing the questionnaire, all schools taught the subject as required material, either completely or as part of a required course dedicating between five and 107.5 hours on the subject as seen in Figures 4 and 5.




Figure 4. Bar Chart for Responses to Question 1




Figure 5. Bar Chart for Responses to Question 2

Questions 3 and 4 ask to what extent the service schools teach the roles and functions of the JOPES Action Officer. Similar to Question 1, this topic is strictly one of education. The responses varied across the spectrum from not teaching the subject at all to one of a

fully required course. Five schools of the seven teach this subject at the required level.

See Figures 6 and 7 for responses.




Figure 6. Bar Chart for Responses to Question 3




Figure 7. Bar Chart for Responses to Question 4

Questions 5 and 6 ask the respondent to rate to what level their school teaches the use of software tools to allow action officers to manipulate JOPES. This topic can be considered both an education and training topic. As seen in Figures 8 and 9, only one school taught the subject, and the subject was only taught as part on an elective.




Figure 8. Bar Chart for Responses to Question 5




Figure 9. Bar Chart for Responses to Question 6

Questions 7 and 8 are also a combination of knowledge and skill topics. This would require the subject to be taught as both knowledge and a skill requiring education and training. Similar to the topic covered in Questions 5 and 6, this subject was taught by one school as an elective and by another as part of a required course. The specific responses can be seen in Figure 10 and 11.




Figure 10. Bar Chart for Responses to Question 7




Figure 11. Bar Chart for Responses to Question 8

Questions 9 and 10 ask the respondents to respond to how much TPFDD Editing is taught at the individual service schools. TPFDD Editing is mainly as skill taught by training rather than education. As seen in Figures 12 and 13, only one school taught the topic and for only a two hour period.




Figure 12. Bar Chart for Responses to Question 9




Figure 13. Bar Chart for Responses to Question 10

Questions 11 and 12 ask about a topic that follows the topic covered in Questions 9 and 10. The topic asked about is mainly a skill rather than knowledge. As seen in Figures 14 and 15, the responses were similar to those of Questions 9 and 10. Only one service school teaches this topic and it is only taught for one hour.




Figure 14. Bar Chart for Responses to Question 11




Figure 15. Bar Chart for Responses to Question 12

Questions 13 and 14 ask the respondents about a topic that is one of knowledge as opposed to a skill. As seen in Figures 16 and 17, six of the seven respondent service schools taught this topic.




Figure 16. Bar Chart for Responses to Question 13




Figure 17. Bar Chart for Responses to Question 14

Questions 15 and 16 were designed to measure to what level the service schools are teaching the subject of support planning, TPFDD maintenance and the players and purpose of the refinement conference. These topics are taught as knowledge rather than of skills. As seen in Figures 18 and 19, six schools taught the topics covered by Question 15, and five of the six taught the subject as part of a required course.




Figure 18. Bar Chart for Responses to Question 15




Figure 19. Bar Chart for Responses to Question 16

The final two questions, Questions 17 and 18 were designed to measure to what level the service schools are teaching the overall topic of Joint Deployment. This topic is a knowledge topic, and as seen in Figures 20 and 21, is well covered by the service schools.




Figure 20. Bar Chart for Responses to Question 17




Figure 21. Bar Chart for Responses to Question 18

## **V. Findings and Conclusion**

### **Is the training and education offered by PME institutions adequate to prepare future action officers for their roles in the joint deployment of military forces?**

The study compared what is being taught about the JDP by the Joint Deployment Training Center to current and future action officers. It then compared the level of instruction given by the JDTC with some of the intermediate and senior service schools. The finding of the study indicated that the service schools taught doctrine to an adequate level, yet provided insufficient skills training to apply the knowledge. In all fairness, intermediate and senior service schools are not charged with training, their mission is to educate. However, this study shows a lack of hands-on training required by planning action officers. Therefore, it is the opinion of this author that intermediate and senior service PME institutions are not training the JDP for future action officers.

### **Is the Lack of Training at the Service PME Institutions Acceptable**

The lack of JDP training by the PME institutions is not an acceptable situation. In fact, there was a successful effort by United States Transportation Command (USTRANCOM) to have included the problem of the lack of JDP training curricula in PME institutions in a Special Area of Emphasis (SAE) to Joint Staff J-7 Military Education Coordination Council (MECC) working group chairman on Deployment Training. The MECC working group is scheduled to meet in the May 2003 timeframe. The point of this effort is to push this matter to the forefront of the JPME colleges. If this problem is accepted as a SAE, all PME colleges will have to evaluate it for inclusion into their curricula. However, inclusion of the SAE into the curricula of the PME colleges is not required. (CJCSI 1800.01A, 2000: C-1)

## **Alternatives to Linking the JDTC with the Warfighters**

Clearly, responses to the survey pointed to changing the status quo. The data portrayed in Figures 8, 10, 12, and 14 all support this. The Joint Deployment Training Center offers valuable training to current and future action officers charged with effectively and efficiently planning and executing the deployment of U.S. forces. There are several alternatives available to PME institutions that will allow the JDTC to reach more officers with its training.

### **Alternative 1: JDTC Develop Curricula for PME Colleges**

The JDTC has a staff of both military officers and contractors. The first alternative to increasing the amount of JDP training is fairly simple on paper, yet might be more difficult to execute. This option would include allowing the JDTC to develop curricula for all PME colleges. Since the JDTC already has an established course covering both doctrine and application, the JOPES Action Officer Course, the transition to a PME course should not be too difficult. In addition, the instructors of the JDTC would initially teach at the PME colleges, until the PME instructors could be brought up to speed and were able to instruct the JDTC developed course on their own. There are advantages and disadvantages to this alternative. The main advantage to this alternative would be the action officer would receive standardized training regardless of which PME college attended. Also, since a stand-alone course currently exists, this alternative could be implemented relative quickly. The main disadvantages of this alternative is that there are so few instructors available at the JDTC on a daily basis, that the number of manning billets would have to be increased to support this higher instructor tempo. Increasing

manning billets can be very difficult and usually, the billets have to be taken from someplace else. Also, each PME college would have to have a dedicated area for the hardware suite required for training individuals. This can be very costly, or impossible if the space simply does not exist. Also, the instructors of the PME colleges are busy with their current load of instruction. Finding time to learn a new course could prove difficult.

## **Alternative 2: Mobile Training Teams**

Currently, the JDTC uses Mobile Training Teams (MTTs) to supplement their in-house training of individuals. MTTs are simply JDTC instructors (both military and contractors) that are both experts in the JDP and expert instructors. Their mission is to provide quality on-the-job training to the people that need it. In higher than usual ops tempo periods, the MTTs are actually used to supplement the combatant commander's staff regarding the JDP. Because of the military's increased ops tempo (now standard), many times individuals find it difficult if not impossible to take a week out their schedule to attend a training course. This alternative would sidestep the issue of what is taught at PME colleges and focus training specifically where it is needed. When a combatant commander has individuals that need training, and they simply cannot be spared due to operational concerns, the combatant commander can contact the JDTC for a MTT visit. As with any alternative, there are advantages and disadvantages. The first advantage of this alternative is only the people that actually require the JDTC training would get the training. This would save much time and energy since not all attendees of PME colleges will be on a planning staff requiring JDP training. Another advantage to this approach is the action officers requiring this instruction would still get standardized training from the JDTC. Also, the tremendous expense of outfitting the PME colleges with a JDP lab would be omitted. The main disadvantage to this alternative is the lack of manning to

support this alternative. Currently, the JDTC has 12 contract instructors and four officers assigned to instruct and to develop courseware. It is not too difficult to see that manning would become extremely tight very quickly at the JDTC should this alternative be exercised.

### **Alternative 3: USJFCOM Absorb the JDTC**

The third alternative presented is moving the JDTC away from USTRANSCOM and placing it under USJFCOM. USJFCOM is the joint force trainer of the armed forces. USJFCOM as the Joint Deployment Process Owner (JDPO) is the DOD Executive Agent for managing joint deployment and redeployment process improvements. Additionally, the JDPO leads DOD collaborative efforts to improve the deployment and redeployment processes, including prioritization of process improvement efforts. (CJCSI 3202.01A, 2000: A-2) Currently the JDTC coordinates with and assist the JDPO, on joint deployment and redeployment process training and doctrine. The JDTC provides training assistance once applications are fielded. (CJCSI 3020.01, 2000: B-3) This realignment would allow changes to JDP curricula more quickly. This realignment would also put the experts from the JDTC where they will be kept up to date with the most recent changes to the JDP. This can reduce redundancy in effort and personnel. This would in effect reduce the number of wheel reinventions. The disadvantage to this alternative is the initial pain of moving billets from one unified command to another. Fortunately, the change could be made gradually, and the geographic relocation could be delayed since Fort Eustis and USJFCOM are relatively close to each other.

### **Alternative 4: Make Plans a Career Field**

Making Plans a career field or specialty similar to a pilot in the Air Force is an alternative that also must be considered. According to Air Force Instruction 36-2101:

The objective of the military personnel classification system is to identify duties and tasks for every position needed to accomplish the Air Force mission. The system is designed to identify qualifications and abilities necessary to accomplish these duties and tasks, as well as provide clear and visible career progression patterns. (AFI 36-2101, 2001:4)

This concept can be expanded to all service rather than just the Air Force. This alternative has several benefits. First, the Plans career field can grow officers from the rank of O-1 that will understand and live the planning process. Rather than removing officers from their career field to try to be on a planning staff for two or less years, each service will be able to provide individual that have all have sound doctrinal and applications backgrounds. Since there will be less downtime due to getting an individual up to speed, the individual will be able to contribute more quickly. Additionally, well-trained individuals will be able to use the system more efficiently and effectively. The disadvantages are few with the exception of changing the system to include a new career field in each of the services. This will cost scarce resources.

#### **Findings: The Proposal, Alternative 5**

It is the recommendation of this project that a combination of Alternatives 1 and 3 be adopted to better train the mid-level officers on the Joint Deployment Process. This concept is so important that it should not take a back seat to other important concepts taught at the PME colleges. Rather than target officers already in planning positions, all in-residence students of intermediate and senior service schools need both education and training on this subject. Additionally, placing the JDTC under USJFCOM makes sense. This will allow the expert instructors and courseware developers the benefit of being able to more quickly update courseware, and to actually being able to guide the evolution of

the JDP. Additionally, if all intermediate and senior service schools are trained on the subject, the concept of the MTT will be one of extreme exception rather than the norm.

### **Limitations and Conclusion**

The methodology and findings of this study include limitations that provide the basis for further research on this topic. First, although it is apparent that the service PME colleges do not teach the JDP to the same level as the JDTC, a more accurate assessment of the level of training given by the PME colleges might come from the graduates of the PME colleges. A repeated study aimed at graduates of the PME colleges rather than the PME colleges would provide a more accurate picture of what is being taught by the PME colleges. This would reduce the bias of the individual PME colleges to their own programs. Additionally, in several instances, the PME colleges reported that the topic was taught as an elective. The questionnaire did not ask about the level of participation in the elective courses. This could potentially lend additional weight to the findings.

Next, a survey or questionnaire of officers working on planning staffs would also be of benefit. Further research could determine if the training of the JDTC is of enough value to be continued. A questionnaire targeting two groups of planners, a group trained by the JDTC and a group learning the topic strictly “on-the-job”, could either highlight the need to expand the AOR of the JDTC or minimize it

Furthermore, although the cost of adopting the selected alternative will be high, the actual dollar amount of implementing the proposed solution was beyond the scope of this study.

Joint Deployment Process instruction must reach the officers requiring it. Regardless of where this happens, this topic is important enough to be both *trained* and *educated*.

## Appendix A: Survey Questionnaire

Thank you for participating in this survey. I appreciate your time and straightforward candid answers. There are a few things you need to know before completing this questionnaire:

1) Survey responses are anonymous. Your identity will remain confidential and will not be associated with any responses you give. This questionnaire complies with AFI 36-2601, *Air Force Personnel Survey Program*. This survey is “non-attribution”, and you have “academic freedom” to tell me what you really think.

2) Summarized responses are releasable to the public under the Freedom of Information Act, but, again, your identity will not be associated with a questionnaire.

3) Please complete the survey electronically, and e-mail it back to me at [ron.sperling@amc.af.mil](mailto:ron.sperling@amc.af.mil)

4) Some items may seem to ask the same question. This is a necessary research technique.

5) There are 18 questions

6) I need the following information in case I have questions about your survey:

NAME:

RANK/GRADE:

DUTY TITLE:

DAYTIME COMMERCIAL PHONE:

DAYTIME DSN PHONE:

EMAIL:

7) For questions about anything about this survey, please call me at DSN 650-7740, or e-mail: [ron.sperling@amc.af.mil](mailto:ron.sperling@amc.af.mil)

Please rate the level of coverage by your institution of the following topics using the scale below.

**Note:** To respond to the following odd numbered questions, place an “x” in the corresponding column to select your answer. For the following even numbered questions, please enter a numerical value in the column marked Hours.

1	2	3	4
Subject not taught at this institution at this time	Subject taught as part of an elective course	Subject partially taught as part of a required course	Subject completely taught as part of a required course

1)	1	2	3	4
<p><b>JOPES (Joint Operations Planning and Execution System) Processes, Terms and Concepts</b></p> <p>This topic includes:</p> <p>Joint Planning and Execution Community (JPEC) membership</p> <p>Participants, activities and results of Campaign Planning</p> <p>Participants, activities and results of Deliberate Planning</p> <p>Participants, activities and results of Crisis Action Planning</p> <p>Participants, activities and results of and Exercise Planning</p> <p>Purposes, appropriate uses, alternatives, messages, participants, and processes involved in developing Requests for Forces (RFFs)</p> <p>Purposes, appropriate uses, alternatives, messages, participants, and processes involved in developing Deployment Orders (DEPORs) in Crisis Action Planning</p> <p>Identifying the common terminology and definitions associated with JOPES processes and Time-Phased Force and Deployment Data (TPFDD) development</p>				
<p><b>2)</b> If you answered either 2, 3, or 4 for the previous question, how many in-class hours (to the nearest 1/2 hour) are spent teaching this subject</p>	<b>Hours</b>			

<p><b>3)</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>JOPES Action Officer Roles and Functions</b></p> <p>This topic includes:</p> <p>The roles and functions of the Action Officer in JOPES planning and TPFDD development</p>	1	2	3	4
<p><b>4)</b> If you answered either 2, 3, or 4 for the previous question, how many in-class hours (to the nearest 1/2 hour) are spent teaching this subject</p>	<b>Hours</b>			
<p><b>5)</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>JOPES Software Tools</b></p> <p>This topic includes:</p> <p>Global Command and Control System (GCCS) launching and use, use of collaborative tools, and copying a plan using JOPES Editing Tools (JET)</p> <p>Login to Global Command and Control System (GCCS), loading user profiles, and launching the Application Manager window</p> <p>Using JOPES Editing Tools (JET), to copy plan</p>	1	2	3	4
<p><b>6)</b> If you answered either 2, 3, or 4 for the previous question, how many in-class hours (to the nearest 1/2 hour) are spent teaching this subject</p>	<b>Hours</b>			
<p><b>7)</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>TPFDD Letters of Instructions (LOIs), Supplements, Guidance, and Compliance Checks</b></p> <p>This topic includes:</p> <p>Using a Joint TPFDD LOI, and a TPFDD with associated LOI Supplemental Instructions, analyze effectiveness of guidance, verify compliance with guidance as written, and propose modifications to guidance.</p> <p>Using a Joint TPFDD LOI, and a TPFDD with associated LOI Supplemental Instructions, analyze key elements of the Joint TPFDD LOI</p> <p>Evaluating compliance in the building of a TPFDD with the Joint TPFDD LOI and the associated Supplemental Instructions.</p>	1	2	3	4
<p><b>8)</b> If you answered either 2, 3, or 4 for the previous question, how many in-class hours (to the nearest 1/2 hour) are spent teaching this subject</p>	<b>Hours</b>			

<p><b>9)</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>TPFDD Editing</b></p> <p>This topic includes:</p> <p>Using JOPES Editing Tools (JET) to create, split, and fragment/insert Unit Line Numbers (ULNs)</p> <p>Using JET to create and source a nonstandard Unit Line Number (ULN) in compliance with the most current TPFDD LOI Supplemental Instructions</p> <p>Using JET to remove records from selected Force Modules in compliance with the most current TPFDD LOI Supplemental Instructions</p>	1	2	3	4
<p><b>10)</b> If you answered either 2, 3, or 4 for the previous question, how many in-class hours (to the nearest 1/2 hour) are spent teaching this subject</p>	<b>Hours</b>			
<p><b>11)</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>TPFDD Error Checking and Correction</b></p> <p>This topic includes:</p> <p>Using JOPES Editing Tools (JET) to identify and correct selected TPFDD errors</p> <p>Identify TPFDD errors that will preclude movement of the requirements</p>	1	2	3	4
<p><b>12)</b> If you answered either 2, 3, or 4 for the previous question, how many in-class hours (to the nearest 1/2 hour) are spent teaching this subject</p>	<b>Hours</b>			
<p><b>13)</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>TPFDD validation and movement</b></p> <p>This topic includes:</p> <p>Identifying the process of verification/validation and its purpose</p> <p>Identifying by whom and when the TPFDD C-Day is set</p> <p>The advantages and disadvantages of delegation of validation authority to subordinated and supporting commands.</p> <p>Validating, unlocking, and revalidating selected TPFDD records within and outside the validation window; and posting related validation messages to the appropriate newsgroups</p>	1	2	3	4
<p><b>14)</b> If you answered either 2, 3, or 4 for the previous question, how many in-class hours (to the nearest 1/2 hour) are spent teaching this subject</p>	<b>Hours</b>			

<p><b>15)</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>Support planning, TPFDD Maintenance and Refinement Conference</b></p> <p>This topic includes:</p> <p>How a commander organizes for support, the policies and procedures established for the operation, host nation requirements and support available, and the automated application used to calculate sustainment requirement.</p> <p>Identifying the purpose and structure of the USTRANSCOM-hosted TPFDD Refinement Conference and the importance of performing a TPFDD Type Unit Characteristics file (TUCHA) update.</p> <p>Identifying the functions and capabilities of Joint Flow and Analysis System for Transportation (JFAST)</p> <p>Performing Update TPFDD from TUCHA functions</p>	1	2	3	4
<p><b>16)</b> If you answered either 2, 3, or 4 for the previous question, how many in-class hours (to the nearest 1/2 hour) are spent teaching this subject</p>	<b>Hours</b>			
<p><b>17)</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>Joint Deployment Process</b></p> <p>This topic includes:</p> <p>Understanding the four phases of Joint Deployment Process and how/where they fit into the 5/6 phases of deliberate/crisis planning. The four phases are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Pre-deployment activities</li> <li>- Movement to and activities at the Port of Embarkation (POE)</li> <li>- Movement to the Port of Debarkation (POD)</li> <li>- Reception, Staging, Onward Movement and Integration (RSOI)</li> </ul> <p>Understanding Single Mobility System (SMS) capabilities and uses within deployment user community.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Air Mobility functions and tracking abilities currently available within Single Mobility System (SMS).</li> <li>- Surface/Sea Mobility functions and tracking abilities currently available within SMS.</li> </ul> <p>Understanding Global Transportation Network (GTN) functions and tracking abilities currently available and useful at unit/user level.</p>	1	2	3	4
<p><b>18)</b> If you answered either 2, 3, or 4 for the previous question, how many in-class hours (to the nearest 1/2 hour) are spent teaching this subject</p>	<b>Hours</b>			

**After surveys are analyzed, you will receive your answers compared to a synopsis of those provided by other Service Schools taking this survey**

**THANK YOU for your time.**

**This concludes the survey.**

Major Ron L. Sperling  
Advanced Study of Air Mobility  
AMWC/WCDA  
Bldg 5656 Texas Avenue  
Fort Dix, NJ 08640

**Appendix B: Summary of Responses**

<b>Question: Respondent:</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>1</b>	3	12	3	12	1	0	1	0
<b>2</b>	3	8	3	2	1	0	3	2
<b>3</b>	3	5	2	2	2	9	2	2
<b>4</b>	4	16	1	0	1	0	1	0
<b>5</b>	4	107.5	3	1	2	6	3	1.5
<b>6</b>	4	6	3	10	1	0	1	0
<b>7</b>	3	8	3	12	1	0	1	0
<b>Total</b>	24	162.5	18	39	9	15	12	5.5
<b>Average</b>	3.43	23.21	2.57	5.57	1.29	2.14	1.71	0.79
<b>Mode</b>	3	8	3	12	1	0	1	0
<b>Low Value</b>	3	5	1	0	1	0	1	0
<b>High Value</b>	4	107.5	3	12	2	9	3	2
<b>Range</b>	1	102.5	2	12	1	9	2	2

<b>Question: Respondent:</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>1</b>	1	0	1	0	3	0.5	3	0.5
<b>2</b>	1	0	1	0	4	3	3	2
<b>3</b>	2	2	2	1	2	1.5	2	2
<b>4</b>	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	0
<b>5</b>	2	2.5	3	11	2	1	4	5.5
<b>6</b>	1	0	1	0	3	6	3	2
<b>7</b>	1	0	1	0	3	0.5	3	0.5
<b>Total</b>	14	14	35	39	39	22	19	19
<b>Average</b>	2.00	2.00	5.00	5.57	5.57	3.14	2.71	2.71
<b>Mode</b>	1	1	3	6	6	3	2	2
<b>Low Value</b>	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	0
<b>High Value</b>	2	2.5	3	11	4	6	4	5.5
<b>Range</b>	1	2.5	2	11	3	6	3	5.5

<b>Question:</b>		
<b>Respondent:</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>1</b>	3	4
<b>2</b>	4	3
<b>3</b>	2	3
<b>4</b>	4	3
<b>5</b>	4	2
<b>6</b>	4	8
<b>7</b>	3	4
<b>Total</b>	14	14
<b>Average</b>	2.00	2.00
<b>Mode</b>	1	1
<b>Low Value</b>	2	2
<b>High Value</b>	4	8
<b>Range</b>	2	6

NOTE: Shaded responses indicate answers that fall more than two units from the mean of all responses.

## **Appendix C: Compendium of Acronyms Used**

AFB - Air Force Base

AO - Action Officer

AOR - area of responsibility

C2 - command and control

CC - Commander

CINC - Commander In Chief

CJCSI - Chairman of the Joint Chief of Staff Instruction

CONUS - Continental United States

DoD - Department of Defense

FVT - Force Validation Tool

GCCS - Global Command and Control System

GTN - Global Transportation Network

ILC - Intermediate Level College

IT - Information Technology

JAOC - Joint Air Operations Center

JDP - Joint Deployment Process

JDPI - Joint Deployment Process Improvement

JDTC - Joint Deployment Training Center

JFACC- Joint Forces Air Component Commander

JFC - Joint Forces Commander

JOPES - Joint Planning and Execution System

JRSOI - Joint Reception, Staging, Onward Movement, and Integration

JTF - Joint Task Force

LOI - Letter of Instruction

MECC - Military Education Coordination Council

MTT - Mobile Training Team

NCA - National Command Authority

PME - Professional Military Education

POD - Port of Debarkation

POE - Port of Embarkation

SAE - Special Area of Emphasis

SLC - Senior Level College

SMS - Single Mobility Manager

TPFDD - Time Phased Force Deployment Data

USAF - United States Air Force

USATC&C - United States Army Transportation Center and School

USJFCOM - United States Joint Forces Command

USTRANSCON - United States Transportation Command

## Bibliography

- Air Force Instruction 31-2101. Classifying Military Personnel (Officer and Enlisted). Washington DC: Headquarters, USAF, 30 April 2001.
- Chairman of the Joint Chief of Staff Instruction (CJCSI) 1800.01A. Officer Professional Military Education Policy. 1 December 2000.
- Chairman of the Joint Chief of Staff Instruction (CJCSI) 3020.01. Managing, Integrating, and Using Joint Deployment Information Systems. 12 June 2000
- Chairman of the Joint Chief of Staff Instruction (CJCSI) 3202.01A, Joint Deployment and Distribution Process Improvement, 31 May 2000.
- “Joint Deployment Overview Course.” CD-ROM. Joint Deployment Training Center, 2002.
- Joint Deployment Training Center (JDTC). United States Transportation Command. Excerpt from an unpublished article. n. pag. <http://www.jdtc.transcom.mil/> 14 Jan 2003
- Joint Deployment Training Center. United States Transportation Command. Recommendation of Special Area of Emphasis to Joint Staff J-7 Military Education Coordination Council Working Group Chairman on Deployment Training. 2002
- Joint Pub 1-02. Department of Defense Dictionary of Military and Associated Terms. Washington DC: Joint Chiefs of Staff Publication, 12 April 2001 (As Amended through 9 January 2003).
- Joint Pub 3-0. Doctrine for Joint Operations. Washington DC: Joint Chiefs of Staff Publication, 1 February 1995.
- Joint Pub 3-35. Joint Deployment and Redeployment Operations. Washington DC: Joint Chiefs of Staff Publication, 7 September 1999.
- Joint Pub 4-01. Joint Doctrine for the Defense Transportation System. Washington DC: Joint Chiefs of Staff Publication, 17 June 1997.
- JOPEs Action Officer Course (JAOC). United States Transportation Command. Joint Deployment Training Center (TCJ3/J4-JDTC). 3 Jan 2003.
- Limanauskiene, Virginija, “Chapter 4, Web-Based Training”, Excerpt from unpublished article. n. pag.

[http://daugenis.mch.mii.lt/UNESCOeducation/WebTrainingWeb/materials/wbt\\_3/back-i-en.htm](http://daugenis.mch.mii.lt/UNESCOeducation/WebTrainingWeb/materials/wbt_3/back-i-en.htm). 19 April 2003.

Moore, John W. "Education versus Training" Journal of Chemical Education 1998  
Volume 75 p135.

Science Applications International Corporation (SAIC)., "Joint Deployment Training Center (JDTC) Implementation Project". 30 September 1996

Science Applications International Corporation (SAIC)., "Joint Deployment Training Center Initial Operational Capability CDRL A068 Training Evaluation Document", Contract DI-ILSS-81524. 17 April 1998

## Vita

Major Ron L. Sperling was born on 16 April 1964 in Colorado Springs, Colorado. He graduated from Poquoson High School in Poquoson, Virginia in June 1982. Major Sperling entered undergraduate studies at Christopher Newport College in Newport News, Virginia. He graduated with a Bachelor of Science in Business in June 1987. Major Sperling entered graduate studies at Old Dominion in Norfolk, Virginia. He graduated with a Masters of Business Administration in December 1988. He was commissioned through Officer Training School at Lackland AFB, Texas, in December 1989. Major Sperling entered graduate studies at University of Colorado in Colorado Springs, Colorado. He graduated with a Masters of Engineering in Space Operations, August 1997

His first assignment was at Lowry AFB, as a student in Undergraduate Space Training in January 1990. He earned the space operations rating in May 1990, and was assigned to the 1st Space Operations Squadron at Falcon AFB, Colorado as a Global Positioning System satellite operator. In January 1994, he was assigned as a Space Control Analyst in the Space Control Center at Cheyenne Mountain Air Station, Colorado Springs. In August 1996, he was assigned to the 534th Training Squadron, Vandenberg AFB, California, instructing Global Positioning System satellite operations in which he became an Air Education and Training Command Master Instructor. In May 1999, he was assigned to the 564th Missile Squadron, Malmstrom AFB, Montana as an Intercontinental Ballistic Missile Crew Commander. In May 2002, he entered the Advanced Study of Air Mobility at the Air Mobility Warfare Center, Fort Dix, New

Jersey. Major Sperling is a Senior Space Operator and a Missile Operator. Upon graduation, he will be assigned to United States Joint Forces Command, Suffolk, VA.

# REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE

*Form Approved*  
OMB No. 0704-0188

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.**

<b>1. REPORT DATE (DD-MM-YYYY)</b> 13 - 06 - 2003	<b>2. REPORT TYPE</b> Graduate Research Project	<b>3. DATES COVERED (From - To)</b> Jun 2002 - Jun 2003
--	--	--

<b>4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE</b> The Future Role of the Joint Deployment Training Center in the Education and Training of  the "Joint Deployment Process" at Intermediate and Senior Service Schools	<b>5a. CONTRACT NUMBER</b>
	<b>5b. GRANT NUMBER</b>
	<b>5c. PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER</b>

<b>6. AUTHOR(S)</b> Sperling, Ron L., Major, U.S. Air Force	<b>5d. PROJECT NUMBER</b>
	<b>5e. TASK NUMBER</b>
	<b>5f. WORK UNIT NUMBER</b>

<b>7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES)</b>  Air Force Institute of Technology Graduate School of Engineering and Management (AFIT/EN) 2950 P Street, Building 640 WPAFB OH 45433-7765	<b>8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER</b>  AFIT/GMO/ENS/03E-12
--	--

<b>9. SPONSORING / MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES)</b> Col Daniel Steadman, United States Army USTRANSCOM Joint Deployment Training Center Ft Eustis, VA DSN 826-6653	<b>10. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S ACRONYM(S)</b> USTRANSCOM TCJ3-JDTC-DIR
	<b>11. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S REPORT NUMBER(S)</b>

**12. DISTRIBUTION / AVAILABILITY STATEMENT**  
Approved for public release, distribution unlimited

**13. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES**

**14. ABSTRACT**  
This project explored the Joint Deployment Process as it is taught by the Joint Deployment Training Center at Ft Eustis, VA. A baseline of joint deployment training was established and Intermediate and Senior Service School Officials were surveyed to assess the level of training and education provided by their respective institutions on the Joint Deployment Process. The research results indicate there is a lack of hands-on training of the Joint Deployment Process curricula (Joint Publication 3-35 and CJCSM 3122 series) at PME institutions. This can most likely be explained by the current mission of the PME institutions. Currently, PME institutions focus on education with some limited training also being accomplished. One recommendation would be to shift the emphasis from a pure education approach to that of one of education *and* training. This project recommends several ways in which the Joint Deployment Training Center can get its training to the future action officers (the very same graduates of PME institutions) responsible of joint deployment.

**15. SUBJECT TERMS**  
Joint Deployment Process, Joint Deployment Training Center, Professional Military Education, Joint Operational Planning and Execution System, Training, Education

<b>16. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF:</b>			<b>17. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT</b>  UU	<b>18. NUMBER OF PAGES</b>  59	<b>19a. NAME OF RESPONSIBLE PERSON</b> Dr William A. Cunningham
<b>a. REPORT</b> U	<b>b. ABSTRACT</b> U	<b>c. THIS PAGE</b> U			<b>19b. TELEPHONE NUMBER (include area code)</b> (937) 255-6565 x4283