

AD-779 563

EFFECTIVENESS OF THE USAR ADDITIONAL  
DRILL PROGRAM

Donald C. Odegard

Army War College  
Carlisle Barracks, Pennsylvania

10 January 1974

DISTRIBUTED BY:

**NTIS**

National Technical Information Service  
U. S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
5285 Port Royal Road, Springfield Va. 22151

AD 779363

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE		READ INSTRUCTIONS BEFORE COMPLETING FORM
1. REPORT NUMBER	2. GOVT ACCESSION NO.	3. RECIPIENT'S CATALOG NUMBER
4. TITLE (and Subtitle)  Effectiveness of the USAR Additional Drill Program		5. TYPE OF REPORT & PERIOD COVERED  Student Essay
7. AUTHOR(s)  LTC Donald C. Odegard, INF		6. PERFORMING ORG. REPORT NUMBER
9. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME AND ADDRESS  US Army War College Carlisle Barracks, Pa. 17013		8. CONTRACT OR GRANT NUMBER(s)
11. CONTROLLING OFFICE NAME AND ADDRESS  Same as Item 9.		10. PROGRAM ELEMENT, PROJECT, TASK AREA & WORK UNIT NUMBERS
14. MONITORING AGENCY NAME & ADDRESS (if different from Controlling Office)		12. REPORT DATE  10 January 1974
		13. NUMBER OF PAGES  26 27
		15. SECURITY CLASS. (of this report)  Unclassified
		15a. DECLASSIFICATION/DOWNGRADING SCHEDULE
16. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of this Report)  Approved for public release; distribution unlimited.		
17. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abstract entered in Block 20, if different from Report)		
18. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES		
19. KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number)		
20. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number)  As the Viet-Nam War was phased down in the early 1970's the strength of the Active Army was substantially reduced. During this time the authorized strength of the reserve components remained constant. As a result the reserve components were increasingly relied upon as a national defense force. This increased reliance brought about a demand for higher levels of readiness training within the reserve components. To assist the Army Reserve units in meeting their company level training standards, additional training time was		

Block 20 continued

authorized. This additional training time was in the form of voluntary additional inactive duty training assemblies for selected individuals. In consonance with the decentralized training concept the additional drills were distributed to the units on an anticipated need basis and the unit commanders were given maximum flexibility in their use. The purpose of this research paper is to determine how this additional training time was used and what effect these drills had on the overall training level of the units.

USAWC RESEARCH PAPER  
(Essay)

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

EFFECTIVENESS OF THE USAR ADDITIONAL  
DRILL PROGRAM

by

Lieutenant Colonel Donald C. Odegard  
(Infantry)

Approved for public release ;  
distribution unlimited.

US Army War College  
Carlisle Barracks, Pennsylvania  
10 January 1974

LIST OF SPECIAL TABLES

Table 1 . . . . .Additional Drill Authorization for  
Company Size Units for FY 1973.

## EFFECTIVENESS OF THE USAR ADDITIONAL DRILL PROGRAM

The established training program of the US Army Reserve parallels that of the Active Army. The same Army Training Programs (ATP) are used by the Army Reserve units. However, instead of completing the ATP in a few consecutive weeks, the Army Reserve units complete this training over a period of three years. This training is conducted intermittently during inactive duty training (IDT) active duty training (ADT) and annual training (AT). Units are authorized 48 IDT drills each fiscal year for all assigned personnel on a required attendance basis. The units are also authorized two weeks AT for all personnel each year. The minimum standard of training is completion of company or equivalent level of training for all reserve component units within three training years of their organization.

In Fiscal Year 1973 the US Army Reserve initiated a program of authorizing voluntary additional Staff/Readiness Training Drills to selected USAR units.<sup>1</sup> The purpose of these additional drills was to help the units meet the increased requirements for unit readiness.

Since different units had varying priorities or readiness standards in terms of mobilization requirements

the additional drill time was authorized in increments depending upon projected training requirements.

The number of drills authorized each Company in FY 1973 has been shown in Table 1.

---

Table 1  
Additional Drill Authorization for Company  
Size Units for FY 1973

---

	Number of Units	Additional Drills Authorized	
		OFF/WO	EM
Group I	77	96	288
Group II	72	72	192
Group III	144	72	168
Group IV	490	72	168
Group V	All Others	None	None

---

Each additional drill represents one man working four hours. The intended use of this additional Staff Readiness training time was for such activities as preparation of training programs, lesson plans, training aids, training presentations, rehearsals and general training administration; staff planning and preparation for Annual Training, coordination with Active Army units and installations and improvement in staff planning and

operational precedures, and staff planning for unit alerts and preparation of equipment loading and other plans related to mobilization requirements.

The purpose of this research paper is to determine how these additional drills were used by the units and to determine if there is a relationship between advancement in unit readiness training status and utilization of the authorized additional drills.

#### Research Procedure

The plan used to gather information was to mail questionnaires to 200 company size units which had been authorized the additional drills. The additional drills had been authorized for larger units such as battalions or groups and smaller units such as separate platoons. In order to gain uniformity of the test sample, company size units only were selected for this study. The units were selected at random on a nation wide basis. All different branches were selected in an effort to get a representative cross section of the entire US Army Reserve troop structure.

Ninety-seven responses were received and all the responses were usable in part or in whole. This was a 48.5% return which is generally accepted as an outstanding response. The fact gathering step of the study was an unqualified success because the number of

responses was large enough to be representative of the entire US Army Reserve troop basis. The 97 responses were 12.4% of the 783 company size US Army Reserve units authorized additional drills in FY 1973. The statistics gathered here were representative of the entire US Army Reserve and are statistically valid for all company size units in the US Army Reserve.

#### QUESTIONNAIRE RESPONSE ANALYSIS

Question #1. In FY 73 my unit was authorized \_\_\_\_\_ officer and \_\_\_\_\_ enlisted additional drills.

The purpose of this question was to have a reference for the next question on use of the drills and to calculate a utilization percentage. Separate from the questionnaire, a direct reference was made to the Department of the Army letter authorizing the additional drills. The exact number of additional drills authorized by Department of the Army was then compared to the number reported being authorized by the units. A surprising response here was that only 24 of the 97 units (24.8%) reported receiving exactly the number of additional drills authorized by Department of the Army. This low percentage emphasized the problems involved in implementing the Department of the Army Directive and revealed the wide dispersion in what the units reported receiving and what they were authorized. Some of the

disparity in answers can be expected in that the Department of the Army authorization letter delegated authority to Army Areas to redistribute, with limitations, drills which had not been used by units in their command. A second reason for units receiving less drills than authorized by Department of the Army was restrictive provisions added in the implementation directive at Army Reserve Command (ARCOM) level. This was revealed in the narrative answer to question #6. A third reason appeared to be confusion created by the different group classifications and the possible combinations of 13 different levels of drill allocations in the Department of the Army letter. This had been recognized as a problem area and the Department of the Army letter authorizing the FY 1974 program reduced to four the different possible levels of drill allocations. A fourth source of error was that some units reported their FY 74 authorization instead of the requested FY 73 authorization. A fifth reason for error was the newness of the program and the lack of prior experience at all levels in implementing the program. The Department of the Army letter of additional drill allocation for FY 74 was changed from the FY 73 version to prohibit transfer of drills between units, to minimize the restrictions on usage placed on the directive at ARCOM level, and to reduce the subgroupings to four.<sup>2</sup>

From the response to this question it is the opinion of the writer that there were many problems in distribution between Department of the Army authorization and receipt at unit level in the FY 73 additional drill program. Secondly, it is the opinion of the writer that the changes made in the FY 74 additional drill program will provide substantial improvement in distributing the FY 74 additional drills to the units.

Question #2. Utilization of extra training time by category of use.

Appendix I shows the reported percentage (25.03% - 22.32%) was for preparation for IDT. It was expected that even more of the time would have been used for IDT preparation. In the narrative answers to question #6, most of the advantages of the program were reported as a result of better preparation for IDT. A high utilization in preparation for AT (18.11% - 17.26%) was also expected because of the increased demands placed on the unit in preparing for the two week training period.

The response for unit mission training (15.46% - 17.00%) was higher than expected because it was not anticipated that the additional drills would be used for unit mission training. Many units commented about the excessive administrative burden and that much of

this administration was done on additional drill time. Unit administration was considered unit mission training and reported here.

Another area that was much higher than expected was preparation for AGI (15.18% - 16.01%). In the opinion of the writer, it is disproportionate that the units spend 15.18% - 16.01% of their additional training time on a four hour inspection which occurs only once a year. However, when viewed in the reserve atmosphere of having the equivalent of 39 total training days per year, it is understandable that a disproportionately large amount of training time is necessarily used for AGI preparation.

In terms of training time available, an annual general inspection for US Army Reserve units is comparable to an Active Army unit undergoing an AGI every eight weeks. By using this comparison, it is obvious that valuable training time is lost in preparation for inspections. Perhaps the question should be asked: "Is an AGI for US Army Reserve units really needed on an annual basis?"

Question #3. Does the training improvement accruing to your unit justify continuing the additional drill program for FY 1975?

Of the 95 answers to this question, 93 responded yes, and 2 responded no (97.9% yes - 2.1% no). This was a

key question to get the opinion of the unit commanders in the most direct way. The 97.9% yes response indicates an overwhelming vote of approval for the additional drill program by the people who are most directly involved, the Company Commanders. The two no answers are also revealing. In one case the Company Commander stated that he was not permitted to use the additional drills at his discretion during periods of time when the unit's needs for time were the greatest. This restriction by a higher headquarters removed the flexibility and the value of the program to the unit was lost. In the second case the Commander reported that his problem was a shortage of primary and mission equipment. With inadequate or obsolete equipment on which to train, no amount of additional training time would help.

Question #4. Would you recommend consolidation of the additional drill program with the required drills?

Of the 91 responses to this question, 28 answered yes, and 63 responded no (30.8% yes - 69.2% no). In designing the questionnaire it was expected that the answer to questions 3 and 4 would be similar. Question 3 concerned the desirability of continuing the program in FY 75. Question 4 considered making the program permanent. The high no response was entirely unexpected, and as such reveals much about the unit commanders feelings toward the reserve program. The comments revealed

a common apprehension about losing the flexibility of the additional drill program if it were made permanent and consolidated with the required 48 drills.

One of the problems considered in the analysis of this question was: "Would the Company Commanders give an answer to reflect their personal desires or an answer to reflect the unit needs?" If the additional drills were viewed as an opportunity for additional income, question 3 and 4 would both have had yes answers. In the opinion of the writer, the 69.2% no answers on question 4 showed that the answers were based on unit needs. These answers tend to improve the validity of the study. In the opinion of the writer, the 69.2% no responses indicate that the value of the additional drill program would be diminished by rigidity of regulations and removed flexibility.

It is the conclusion of the writer that any move to make the additional drill program permanent instead of on the current year-to-year basis should be done very cautiously and in such a way as to preserve the current flexibility.

Question #5. If you could set the number of required drills, how many would you require for all personnel of your unit?

The answers have been shown in appendix I.

A second part of question 5 was - "How many voluntary additional drills would you require?"

Nearly all of the answers were in excess of the present authorization of 48 officer and 120 enlisted drills. Time and scope of this paper does not permit a deeper analysis into the relationship of extra drills needed versus number of required drills selected. The reason for including this question was to see if there was a cost effective way of reducing expenditure on the reserves training time and still attaining company level proficiency. In the opinion of the writer, this possibility was not supported by the answers.

The final part of question 5 was - "With the program you recommended above, could you attain company level proficiency in TY 1974-75 and maintain that level thereafter?"

Of the 93 answers there were 79 yes and 14 no responses (84.9% yes - 15.1% no). A closer look at the no answers showed this relationship with number of required drills recommended.

<u>Recommended Number of Required Drills</u>	<u>Units Which Could not Attain Company Level Proficiency</u>
72	0
60	5
48	8
36	0
24	1
12	0
	<u>14</u>

It is quite significant that 15.1% of the units reporting wrote that they cannot attain company level training proficiency even if they could prescribe their own program. The variation in training necessary for each unit is exemplified by the five units which could not attain company level proficiency even with 60 drills per year for all personnel. Conversely, 15 of 16 units recommending less than 48 drills (Appendix I) say they could attain company level training proficiency.

The writer's conclusions drawn from the answers to this question are:

a. The expectation of 100% of the US Army Reserve units achieving and maintaining company level proficiency is not realistic.

b. A vast majority of units prefer the 48 required drills. However, there are some units who do not require 48 drills per year to attain company level proficiency.

c. There are some units which need more than 48 drills per year. However, even with the additional training time, many of these units could not attain company level proficiency.

d. By selective variation of required drills above 48 for some units and below 48 for some units, plus continuing the additional drill program, nominal readiness gains could be made.

Question #6. Specific advantages and/or disadvantages of the additional drill program to my unit are:

Seventy-two units reported one or more advantages while twenty-one units commented on disadvantages of the program. From the favorable responses some representative comments were selected and are shown here. These remarks were selected because they were typical and the opinions were well expressed. They cover a broad cross section of the subjects discussed in the total sample. In addition these selected comments are a comprehensive commentary on the program.

The additional drills provide an opportunity for the officers and NCO's to concentrate on specific problem areas and projects. Efficiency not attainable during regular drills is achieved and more work is accomplished as a result of it. The drills allow the extra time needed to accomplish the additional requirements placed on a unit of this size.

Additional drills allow a flexible opportunity to have staff, key NCO's and required EM available to complete administrative functions without interfering with mission training. Forty-eight (48) regular drills allow a continuity of scheduling but supervision of mission training during the drills does not allow time to complete planning and complete the required "paperwork war". This unit has had an average of 7 officers and 15 NCO's and EM at the unit every Thursday nite in a volunteer, non-pay status in order to keep this admin and planning requirement current. With increased requirements on training a unit is under constant pressure to move ahead. For these reasons I feel the additional drills are extremely valuable.

The administrative drills are best used by a few key personnel preceding and following the week-end drills and in preparation for and recovery from critical times as AT and AGI.

Voluntary additional drill program allows me to use the most highly qualified and more important, most highly motivated personnel much more than prior to the program. After all, you can get these men in some time for a while without pay but not indefinitely. I can now get the 5% who do 95% of the work when I need them and get more work production per time period. The program allows flexibility in overall operation and lends continuity through the period between scheduled drills.

Prior proper planning has enabled my unit to improve 100% in the training area and cut the communications gap between personnel. They are an incentive to key personnel. With time for proper planning less time is wasted on drill days and retention rate is better because training is meaningful.

We can plan on everything we will be doing in advance so that we are completely organized first thing of drill day. That way the people in charge can also train with the main body of troops rather than make out lessons and training plans during the drill itself.

We have used the additional drills for our officers and NCO's to prepare for the following required drills. I have found this results in much more organized required drills and more beneficial training for the men. I feel it is a good program and if used properly can be quite effective in making USAR units more proficient.

The additional drills have been of outstanding help in training of key personnel. It has provided these personnel with the opportunity to plan for each drill and thereby be more aware of the problems and to provide solutions. It has given key administrative/supply personnel the ability to operate their areas with more continuity and purpose. They have definitely made improvements in this unit as key personnel now have a much more current knowledge of their individual responsibilities.

It creates a more effective training program within the unit.

Supervision provided by the additional drill program permits more effective ET training of REP-63 personnel.

Selected representative examples of the disadvantages of the additional drill program follow.

Present system of limiting each man to 12 UTA's removes the freedom of selecting the best man for a given job.

Additional drills meet with some opposition particularly in the younger reservist. Even key personnel find themselves caught between loyalty to employer, USAR and family.

I would like to see each commander authorized a certain number of additional drills which can be used at his discretion during periods of time when the unit's needs for time are the greatest, e.g. preparation for IG. Under the present set-up, if drills are not used, the time is lost and there is no assurance that additional time will be forthcoming.

Your survey presupposes that units have at least enough equipment to conduct meaningful mission-oriented unit training. Such is (not) the case with my unit - an almost total lack of authorized communication equipment in even representative amounts has required the unit to improvise extensively in many different directions in order to provide any meaningful training.

#### Analysis of the Disadvantages.

Disadvantages reported fall into four categories; 12 drill limit per individual reduces the effectiveness, unit personnel do not have the time available to perform the 12 additional drills, limitations in usage reduce the effectiveness of the program, and the unit lacks the equipment to train on so the additional drills do not improve training.

There are in each unit a few people who are most effective and productive. In a reserve atmosphere,

looking only at the reserve demands the most work could be accomplished by concentrating the extra time on those few. However, to promote the effectiveness of the entire unit and develop back up skilled personnel in the event of a mobilization, the extra time needs to be spread across a wider segment of the entire unit. Considering the balance between availability of personnel, limitations on individuals time, and desire to achieve most effective production from the drills it appears to the writer that the present limitation of 12 drills per individual per year is about right. Possibly this could be increased to 20 per individual, but excessive reliance on a few individuals to the detriment of the unit would occur at some point.

#### SUMMARY

The results of the survey show that the voluntary additional inactive duty training assembly program has proved to be an exceptionally valuable program for the US Army Reserve. It has been met with open arms acceptance by the unit commanders. Flexibility in management of the program at unit level is a most valuable feature. Numerous responses reported an overall improvement in the entire training program because key individuals now have the opportunity to plan future training and then supervise and conduct

that same training. One of the responses summed up the program with the following statement: "I think the additional drills (program) is the best thing that has happened to the USAR." It is the opinion of the writer that this is a valid commentary on the program.

  
DONALD C. ODEGARD  
LTC, Inf, USAR

FOOTNOTES

<sup>1</sup>Department of the Army letter, Authorized Additional  
FY 1973 Inactive Duty Training Assemblies for US Army  
Reserve, September 1, 1972.

<sup>2</sup>Department of the Army letter, Authorized Additional  
FY 1974 Inactive Duty Training Assemblies for US Army  
Reserve, June 5, 1973.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

Department of the Army Letter, DAAG-ASM DAAR-OT,  
Authorized Additional FY 1973 Inactive Duty Training  
Assemblies for US Army Reserve, September 1, 1972.

Department of the Army Letter, DAAG-ASM DAAR-OT,  
Authorized Additional FY 1974 Inactive Duty Training  
Assemblies for US Army Reserve, June 5, 1973.

APPENDIX I

Sample Questionnaire . . . Cover Letter - page 22

Questionnaire page 23-24

(Accumulated responses are shown in parenthesis  
and % response is shown where applicable also  
in parenthesis.)

7711 Donnybrook Court, T-7  
Annandale Virginia 22003

19 OCT 1973

Commanders of Selected  
Army Reserve Units

Dear Sir:

I am a student in the Army War College. One of the requirements is a student research project. The subject I have chosen is: "Value of the Additional Drill Program to the USAR".

My purpose in writing to you is to ask your assistance in providing the data on your unit. I realize that I am asking you to contribute time from an already crowded schedule. However, you could benefit directly from the project because it is the only such attempt to measure the value of the additional drill program and the final report will be made available as a reference for future planning and implementation of the program.

The validity and substance of the final report will be improved by a high percentage of responses and accurate utilization figures.

Again, your assistance is sincerely appreciated.



DONALD C. ODEGARD  
LTC IN USAR

ADDITIONAL INACTIVE DUTY TRAINING ASSEMBLIES QUESTIONNAIRE

1. In FY 73 my unit was authorized \_\_\_\_\_ officer and \_\_\_\_\_ enlisted additional drills.

2. Utilization of extra training time by category of use:

	EXTRA IDT DRILLS (man-assemblies)	
	OFF	EM
a. Unit mission training	15.46%	17.00%
b. Preparation for IDT (includes writing of lesson plans, CP's and FTX's, preparation of training aids, rehearsals, coordination with other units)	25.03%	22.32%
c. Recovery from IDT (includes writing reports, critiques, maintenance of equipment)	8.30%	9.69%
d. Preparation for AT (includes advance detachments and precamp conferences)	18.11%	17.26%
e. Recovery from AT (includes writing reports, critiques and rear detachments)	3.77%	4.25%
f. Specialized Training (includes training for specific individuals or MOS, not applicable to the entire unit)	6.08%	6.20%
g. Preparation for AGI (Maintenance, Mobilization Plan,	15.18%	16.01%
h. Other <u>AGI Corrections</u> )	8.07%	7.27%
TOTAL IDT DRILLS USED FY 73		

3. Does the training improvement accruing to your unit justify continuing the additional drill program for FY 1975?

(95 Answers) YES  (93) (97.9%) NO  (2) (2.1%)

4. Would you recommend consolidation of the additional drill program with the required drills?

(91 Answers) YES  (28) (30.8%) NO  (63) (69.2%)

5. If you could set the number of required drills, how many would you require for all personnel of your unit?

- (Check One)
- 72  ( 6)
  - 60  (17)
  - 48  (55)
  - 36  ( 6)
  - 24  ( 8)
  - 12  ( 2)

How many voluntary additional drills would you need?

	NO. PERSONNEL		NO. DRILLS	=	TOTAL EXTRA IDT DRILLS
OFFICER	<input type="text"/>	X	<input type="text"/>	=	<input type="text"/>
EM	<input type="text"/>	X	<input type="text"/>	=	<input type="text"/>

With the program you recommended above, could you attain company level proficiency in TY 1974-1975 and maintain that level thereafter?

(93 Answers) YES  (79) (84.9%) NO  (14) (15.1%)

6. Specific advantages and/or disadvantages of the additional drill program to my unit are:

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

(Use back of page for additional answers)