





AN HEURISTIC APPROACH FOR THE SCHEDULING OF NAVY TRAINING COURSES

> William H. Lindahl Benjamin W. Lin

Training Analysis and Evaluation Group

December 1977

JAN 11 1976

GOVERNMENT RIGHTS IN DATA STATEMENT

Reproduction of this publication in whole or in part is permitted for any purpose of the United States Government.

alper F. Smode

ALFRED F. SMODE, Ph.D., Director, Training Analysis and Evaluation Group

REFORT DOCUMENT	TATION PAGE	BEFOR	AD INSTRUCTIONS
AEFONT NUMBER	2. GOVT ACCE	SSION NO. 3. RECIPIENT	'S CATALOG NUMBER
TAEG 52	1.000 161962.00	falstat periodias	
TITLE (and Subtitie)		TYPE OF F	EPORT A BERIOD COVER
AN_HEURISTIC_APPROACH FOR 1	THE SCHEDULING OF	Initia]	Report.
NAVY TRAINING COURSES	x	Jun	-Aug
AUTHOR(.)		8. CONTRACT	A CONT NUMBER(.)
William H. Lindahl D Ben;	jamin W. Lin	(16) ZIT	NOID
		9	
PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME AND	ADDRESS	10. PROGRAM	ELEMENT, PROJECT, TAS
Training Analysis and Evalu	uation Group	(In) TPM	(07)
0F14100, FL 52813		- All	- V
1. CONTROLLING OFFICE NAME AND ADD	RESS	REPORT O	DATE
		Dec	PAGES
		*	12510.
4. MONITORING AGENCY NAME & ADDRES	S(II different from Controllin,	g Office) 15. SECURITY	CLASS. (of thre rop th)
		Unclass	ified
		154. DECLAS	FICATION DOWNGRADING
			-
7. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the about	ect entered in Block 20, 11 d	s unlimited	
7. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the about	ect entered in Block 20, 11 d	s unlimited	
7. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abetr	ect entered in Block 20, if d	s unlimited	
7. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the about	ect entered in Block 20, 11 d	s unlimited	
7. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abote	ect entered in Block 20, 11 d	s unlimited	
7. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the about	ect entered in Block 20, 11 d	s unlimited	<u>\</u>
7. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abot 8. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES 9. KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse eide If n	act ontorod in Block 20, if d	s unlimited (forent from Report) ck number)	
7. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the ebetr 18. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES 9. KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse eide If n Scheduling Navy Tochnical Training	eccesary and identify by blo	s unlimited ((ferent from Report) ck number)	
<ul> <li>7. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the ebetr</li> <li>8. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES</li> <li>9. KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse eide if n Scheduling Navy Technical Training Training Resource Utilizat:</li> </ul>	eccentery and identify by bio	s unlimited (forent from Report) ck number)	
<ul> <li>7. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the ebeta</li> <li>8. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES</li> <li>9. KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse eide If n Scheduling Navy Technical Training Training Resource Utilizat: Automation of a Manual Syst</li> </ul>	eccontered in Block 20, 11 d eccontered in Block 20, 11 d eccontered in Block 20, 11 d	s unlimited (forent from Report) ck number)	
<ul> <li>7. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the ebetr.</li> <li>7. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the ebetr.</li> <li>18. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES</li> <li>9. KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse eide if n Scheduling Navy Technical Training Training Resource Utilizat: Automation of a Manual Syst</li> <li>9. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse eide if ne</li> </ul>	eccentery and identify by block tem for Schedulin	s unlimited (forent from Report) ck number) g k number)	
<ul> <li>7. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the ebetr.</li> <li>7. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the ebetr.</li> <li>8. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES</li> <li>9. KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse elde If n Scheduling Navy Technical Training Training Resource Utilizat: Automation of a Manual Syst</li> <li>7. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse elde If ne Control of a Manual Syst</li> </ul>	eccentered in Block 20, 11 d eccentered in Block 20, 11 d eccentery and identify by bloc ion tem for Schedulin econance of feasibl	s unlimited (forent from Report) ck number) g k number) e schedules for	Navy training
<ul> <li>7. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the ebeta</li> <li>7. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the ebeta</li> <li>8. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES</li> <li>9. KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse elde if n Scheduling Navy Technical Training Training Resource Utilizat: Automation of a Manual Syst</li> <li>7. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse elde if ne Gammand and mainter courses are labor intensive Command. The major constrained</li> </ul>	eccentered in Block 20, 11 d eccentered in Block 20, 11 d eccentery and identify by bloc ion tem for Schedulin foreactory and identify by bloc enance of feasibl throughout the N ints affecting th	s unlimited ((ferent from Report) (ck number) g k number) e schedules for aval Education a is scheduling ar	Navy training nd Training e planned input
<ul> <li>7. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the ebeta</li> <li>7. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the ebeta</li> <li>8. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES</li> <li>9. KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse eide II n Scheduling Navy Technical Training Training Resource Utilizat: Automation of a Manual Syst</li> <li>9. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse eide II ne The generation and mainte courses are labor intensive Command. The major constra- requirements and the suitab</li> </ul>	ect entered in Block 20, if d ect entered in Block 20, if d eccessary and identify by bloc ion tem for Schedulin throughout the N ints affecting th ility/availabilit	s unlimited ""forent from Report) (forent	Navy training nd Training e planned input , equipment, and
<ul> <li>7. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the ebeta</li> <li>7. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the ebeta</li> <li>8. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES</li> <li>9. KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse elde II n Scheduling Navy Technical Training Training Resource Utilizat: Automation of a Manual Syst</li> <li>9. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse elde II ne Courses are labor intensive Command. The major constrained requirements and the suitabilities. An additional of the suitabilities.</li> </ul>	ect entered in Block 20, 11 d ect entered in Block 20, 11 d eccessary and identify by bloc ion tem for Schedulin temance of feasibl throughout the N ints affecting th ility/availabilit constraint is tha	s unlimited ((ferent from Report) (k number) g k number) e schedules for aval Education a is scheduling ar y of instructors t schedules must	Navy training nd Training e planned input , equipment, and be established
<ul> <li>7. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the ebeta</li> <li>7. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the ebeta</li> <li>8. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES</li> <li>9. KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse eide if n Scheduling Navy Technical Training Training Resource Utilizat: Automation of a Manual Syst</li> <li>7. MESTRACT (Continue on reverse eide if ne The generation and mainte courses are labor intensive Command. The major constra- requirements and the suitab- facilities. An additional of for the current year, update out-year planning requirement</li> </ul>	eccentered in Block 20, 11 d eccentery and identify by bloc ion tem for Schedulin throughout the N ints affecting th ility/availabilit constraint is tha ed and revised as	s unlimited ((ferent from Report) (ferent	Navy training nd Training e planned input , equipment, and be established projected for the
<ul> <li>7. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the ebett</li> <li>8. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES</li> <li>9. KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse elde If n Scheduling Navy Technical Training Training Resource Utilizat: Automation of a Manual Syst</li> <li>9. MESTRACT (Continue on reverse elde If ne Courses are labor intensive Command. The major constrative requirements and the suitabi facilities. An additional of for the current year, update out-year planning requirement</li> </ul>	ect entered in Block 20, 11 d ect entered in Block 20, 11 d eccessary and Identify by bloc ion tem for Schedulin throughout the N ints affecting th ility/availabilit constraint is tha ed and revised as its of the 5-Year	s unlimited ((forent from Report) (forent from Report) (ck number) g k number) e schedules for aval Education a is schedules for aval Education a is schedules must necessary, and Defense Plan. ~	Navy training nd Training e planned input , equipment, and be established projected for the
<ul> <li>7. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the ebeta</li> <li>7. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the ebeta</li> <li>8. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES</li> <li>9. KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse eide if n Scheduling Navy Technical Training Training Resource Utilizat: Automation of a Manual Syst</li> <li>7. MESTRACT (Continue on reverse eide if ne Courses are labor intensive Command. The major constrative Command. The major constrative facilities. An additional of for the current year, update out-year planning requiremer</li> <li>7. DISTRIBUTION OF 1 NOV 6</li> </ul>	eccentered in Block 20, 11 d eccentered in Block 20, 11 d eccentery and identify by bloc ion tem for Schedulin temance of feasibl throughout the N ints affecting th ility/availabilit constraint is that ed and revised as its of the 5-Year	s unlimited "(ferent from Report) (ferent	Navy training nd Training e planned input , equipment, and be established projected for the

Ņ

Unclassified

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE (When Data Entered)

This memorandum documents the essential components of scheduling for training at a representative training center, the Fleet Anti-Submarine Warfare Training Center, Pacific. It provides details for the automation of the current scheduling process, with a limited demonstration for a sample of courses. Conclusions and recommendations for additional study efforts related to the development of an automated optimal scheduling system are presented.



5/N 0102- LF- 014- 6601

Unclassified SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE (When Dete Entered)

#### FOREWORD

This task is a subelement of the Design of Training Systems (DOTS) project. The objectives of the DOTS program are in consonance with the requirements of Advanced Development Objective ZPNO7 (formerly ADO 43-03X), Education and Training Development. ZPNO7 includes a number of projects concerned with demonstrating and evaluating the technical, operational and financial feasibility of applying advanced technological applications to improving the training process.

The Bureau of Naval Personnel initiated the original ADO in 1966 to make Naval training more responsive to the changing times. As one project under this effort, DOTS was designed to improve the process of managing training resources through application of the techniques of system analysis and system simulation as accomplished through mathematical modeling. The end objective is a family of computerized mathematical models enabling training management to more rapidly predict the impact of changes in training resource availability or requirements.

The support provided by the Fleet Anti-Submarine Warfare Training Center, Pacific, San Diego, is gratefully acknowledged, in particular, the outstanding cooperation and assistance provided by STGCS P. H. Cooke and STSC (SS) C. R. Honeycutt, as well as the initial interest and direction given by LCDR R. Albright. The support and interest demonstrated by the Commander Training Command, U.S. Pacific Fleet, and especially LCDR P. Madden, are also appreciated.

A number of TAEG personnel should be acknowledged for their contributions to this study: Dr. Myron M. Zajkowski for his efforts in refining and editing the presentation of the material; and Mr. Morris G. Middleton and Dr. Alfred F. Smode, Director of TAEG, for their continued support and encouragement.

### TABLE OF CONTENTS

Section	Page
I	INTRODUCTION
	Statement of the Problem5Background5Purpose6Organization of the Report6
II	ANALYSIS OF THE TRAINING SYSTEM
	Career Path of Sonar Technician
III	AUTOMATION OF THE MANUAL PROCESS
	Program Logic.17Program Operation.17Sample Results19
	Course Schedule Worksheet
IV	CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS
	Conclusions.         23           Recommendations.         23
APPENDIX	A - Program Listing
APPENDIX	B - Program Outputs
APPENDIX	C - Industrial Scheduling Methodology and Its Application to Naval Training
BIBLIOGRA	РНҮ

#### LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS

igure		Page
1	Surface Sonar Technician Career Path	8
2	FLEASWTRACENPAC Course Scheduling System Description	9
3	Logic for Course Requirements	11
4	Logic for Instructor Requirements	12
5	Feasibility Assessment of Proposed Schedule	13
6	Basic Inputs/Outputs of Scheduling Program	16
7	Flow Chart of Program Logic	18
8	Sample Course Schedule Worksheet for ASW Surface Training	20
9	ASW Surface Course Schedule Plotted on a Week-by-Week Basis	21
C-1	Major Interrelationships of the Industrial Production Planning and Scheduling Activities	53
C-2	Network Representation of a Line Balancing Problem	54
C-3	Network Representation of Project Scheduling	56

#### LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1	Input Data for Course Scheduling	17
C-1	Summary of Industrial Scheduling Problems and Solution Techniques	58

#### SECTION I

#### INTRODUCTION

#### STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

The generation and maintenance of a feasible schedule for Navy training courses are labor intensive throughout the Naval Education and Training Command (NAVEDTRACOM). The major constraints affecting this scheduling are planned input requirements and the suitability/availability of instructors, equipment, and facilities. An additional constraint is that schedules must be established for the current year, updated and revised as necessary, and projected for the out-year planning requirements of the 5-Year Defense Plan.

The present scheduling system can be characterized as reactive and highly labor intensive. Guidance is minimal resulting in scheduling processes which are subject to the vagaries of individual style and competency. An improved method for arriving at schedules is needed. Such a scheduling method should optimize the utilization of school resources in meeting training requirements. Other potential benefits which may be derived from the application of this methodology are the reduction of average on board (AOB), the establishment of more defensible training capacity figures, and an increased availability of personnel for other school requirements.

#### BACKGROUND

Operational readiness is a function of the effectiveness of the Navy's education and training programs. Efficient management is the key to maintenance of these programs. Therefore, training policies, plans, and programs must be fully capable of meeting current and future training requirements with reasonable levels of effectiveness and efficiency. The latter can be enhanced by exploiting the current concepts and techniques of operations research, educational technology, systems analysis, and management science in the design and management of Navy training.

The complexity of the scheduling of training within the NAVEDTRACOM has resulted in a process which terminates when a feasible plan is achieved, even though that plan may not be optimal in terms of resource utilization. Trade offs in schedules are made by exception when a crisis situation occurs. The short planning horizon, possibly a week, is designed to result in a responsive scheduling system. Unfortunately, this results in minimum trade off considerations and resource surpluses to maintain responsiveness. Initial indications are that under the present system course planners need approximately 3 months to generate a feasible schedule.

In the search for a viable alternative to the present system, a variety of approaches to operations scheduling employed in industry were examined (see appendix C). In essence, the approaches were found to be inappropriate because they were unable to accommodate the complexity of the variables associated with the scheduling of Navy training courses. Thus, it was determined that the present scheduling system had to be documented in detail, with the necessity for manual scheduling being eliminated through automation, and the feasibility

of an optimal resource utilization/scheduling algorithm being established.

The Fleet Anti-Submarine Warfare Training Center, Pacific (FLEASWTRACENPAC) was selected as the site at which to accomplish the above objectives for the following reasons:

- . it provides an operational setting
- ASW School personnel have solicited assistance, are receptive to assistance, and have a comprehensive understanding of the problem.

The major scheduling effort at the ASW School is divided between surface and submarine sonar technician training. These two areas are comprised of 87 courses, approximately 300 instructors, and a myriad of training equipment both simulated and operational.

#### PURPOSE

The purposes of this report are to:

- . document the essential components of scheduling training at the FLEASWTRACENPAC
- provide results of initial effort to automate the current manual scheduling process
- demonstrate the automated process on a limited sample of courses.

ORGANIZATION OF THE REPORT

In addition to this introduction, the report is divided into three other sections. Section II provides an analysis of the current scheduling approach for a typical training activity. It contains explications of the logic and rationale currently used in arriving at feasible schedules. Preliminary results concerning the automation of this process are presented in section III. Section IV contains the conclusions derived during the limited study period as well as recommendations for additional study efforts related to the development of an automated optimal scheduling system. Appendix A contains a listing of the computer program for the automation of the manual scheduling process with representative outputs provided in appendix B. Appendix C contains an overview of industrial scheduling methodology and its application to Naval training.

#### SECTION II

#### ANALYSIS OF THE TRAINING SYSTEM

This section describes the career paths of sonar technicians in order to provide a better understanding of the training requirements for this type of specialized training. In addition, the data inputs and calculations used to derive school resource requirements are analyzed. The documentation of this process formed the conceptual foundation for the attempt to automate the manual scheduling process.

#### CAREER PATH OF SONAR TECHNICIAN

The training requirements are reflected by career paths because of the various sequences of courses a technician can take during his career. The number and interaction of possible sequences contribute significantly to the complexity of the scheduling problem.

Figure 1 provides an overview of the training career paths open to the surface sonar technician. Similar career paths, with appropriate training, are characteristic of all enlisted Navy ratings or skill categories. All surface sonar technicians take basic core requirements; i.e., STG-A, for 6 weeks. If the trainee is a 4-year obligor (4YO), he then proceeds to one of the four class "A" operator courses (3 to 8 weeks) before going to the fleet for a period of 18 to 24 months. Thirty percent of the 6 year obligor (6YO) students proceed directly from STG-A to a pipeline composed of 6 to 9 weeks of Basic Electricity and Electronics (BE&E), 17 weeks of Sonar Electronics Intermediate (SEI), and finally 12 to 31 weeks of specific operator and maintenance class "C" schools before going to the fleet. The remaining 70 percent of the 6YOs go to the same "A" school operator courses as the 4YOs and then directly to the fleet. After 18 to 24 months with the fleet, this 70 percent resume training on the same pipeline as the other 6YOs previously described. The only additional inputs to the training program are the conversion of sonar technicians from one equipment specialty to another usually necessitated by a change in class of ship assignment and the aperiodic addition of civilians such as contractor or governmental personnel.

The scheduling of training courses in a manner which is responsive to the numerous career paths and pipelines throughout the Navy's rating structure is complex and difficult. The following provides a description and analysis of the manual scheduling system presently used at the FLEASWTRACENPAC. This discription is limited to "A" and "C" Schools.

#### THE FLEET ANTI-SUBMARINE WARFARE TRAINING CENTER, PACIFIC

The scheduling process at this activity is assumed to be representative of other Navy training activities. Figure 2 illustrates the general developmental flow of a schedule and identifies the constraints and requirements impacting on this flow. The training requirements or demand figures generated by the Chief of Naval Operations (CNO) via the Bureau of Naval Personnel (BUPERS), and the Chief of Naval Technical Training (CNTECHTRA) are the basic input to the scheduling process. Based on the availability of suitable equipment and





8

Figure 1. Surface Sonar Technician Career Path

TAEG Report No. 52





Figure 2. FLEASWTRACENPAC Course Scheduling System Description

authorized manpower levels for instructor billets as established by CNO 1000/2 report, an assessment is made as to whether the input requirement can be feasibly met. If requirements can be accommodated, a schedule is generated. If the training requirements cannot be met, the viable alternatives are limited to either a reduction in the training requirement for this activity, subject to its capacity constraints, or sufficient equipment and/or personnel are added. The latter alternative also has associated with it the additional problem of long lead times.

#### COURSE REQUIREMENTS

The Chief of Naval Operations, BUPERS, and CNTECHTRA establish the specific training requirements for each training activity and each course. The documentation of the process is beyond the scope of this study.

Subsequent to the identification of requirements or demand levels for each course, specific course descriptive data such as the course identification number (CIN), the title, the length, and class size are input for consideration. The total demand, or planned input, is divided by the class size to determine the number of course offerings needed to satisfy the input. The number of instructional weeks in a year is then divided by the number of classes required to determine the convening frequency. Based on convening frequency, the number of classes required to be in session concurrently is easily obtained by division of the course length by the convening frequency. This establishes a baseline for the minimum resource requirements necessary to satisfy the training requirements. This process is outlined in figure 3.

#### INSTRUCTOR REQUIREMENTS

Instructor requirements for a course are established by CNTECHTRA Instruction 5311.1A. The logic used in the generation of instructor requirements is shown in figure 4. This logic employs the course descriptive data used in the generation of course requirements. In addition, up to seven pairs of student/instructor ratios with appropriate instructional contact hours are used. The total contact hours are calculated by summing the quotients of the individual pairs of contact hours and student/instructor ratios, and multiplying this sum by the class quota or size. Basic instructor requirements are then determined by considering the convening frequency, the number of contact hours an instructor teaches per week; e.g., 25, and adjusting this figure with a 10 percent increase to cover supervision. The final instructor requirements or fractional instructor requirements are adjusted 12 percent to take into account such considerations as leave and duty. This figure is then rounded upwards to give a whole number value for instructor requirements.

#### FEASIBILITY ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSED SCHEDULE

Once the basic course requirements; i.e., number of convenings required, are established the course schedule is subjected to a feasibility assessment. As figure 5 illustrates, the assessment examines the resource constraints for meeting the requirements. The basic instructor requirements, calculated as described previously, are compared with the manpower authorizations as established by CNO 1000/2 report. If the manpower authorized is equal to, or LOGIC FOR COURSE REQUIREMENTS





11

Logic for Course Requirements

Figure 3.

LOGIC FOR INSTRUCTOR REQUIREMENTS



Figure 4. Logic for Instructor Requirements (Source: CNTECHTRAINST 5311.1A)



exceeds, the basic requirements, it is then possible to proceed with scheduling. If, however, the instructor requirements exceed those authorized, there are several options available to the school. The first is to reprogram instructors within the school from areas which have a surplus. The second is to request additional instructors from external sources. Third, the basic requirement can be modified to agree with capacity figures based on instructor availabilities. The latter tactic is the one usually followed because the first two involve significant time lags. Occasionally, however, the requirement remains fixed and the school must utilize existing resources to meet the requirement. This is accomplished by increasing individual class sizes, but the school tries to avoid such a situation because the resultant training is considered to be degraded.

Equipment requirements and availabilities cause the biggest scheduling constraint at the ASW School in San Diego. The minimum requirements are determined by establishing the concurrent convenings required. If the concurrent convenings exceed the basic number of equipments available, then the options are restricted to requesting additional equipment, changing the basic demand requirements, or scheduling the equipment for more than one shift if instructors are available.

After the feasibility of meeting a training requirement is established, a week-by-week schedule is generated for each course for the fiscal year. Variables or constraints specific to the nature of courses, equipment, pipelines, and people are considered at this time. Ideally, the courses would be scheduled on a single shift basis, convening at the predetermined convening frequency, and level loaded for the entire year.

As indicated earlier, the scheduling process described in this section is estimated to require 3 man months of labor to arrive at a feasible schedule. The automated scheduling process described in the next section is designed to accomplish the same objective; i.e., a feasible schedule, while reducing the labor intensive aspects of the process.

#### SECTION III

#### AUTOMATION OF THE MANUAL PROCESS

The ultimate objective in studying the course scheduling process for Navy specialized training is to develop a methodology which will optimize the schedule and use of resources for a course or group of courses. An initial step in this optimization process is to automate the tedious manual scheduling process and concurrently to determine subsequent efforts to fully optimize the process. An optimal solution will be contingent upon the objectives established by NAVEDTRACOM managers.

Compelling reasons for automating the present manually constructed scheduling system include the following:

- the existing system is most labor intensive
- the basic logic for calculation used in determining the feasibility of a course schedule is straightforward and adaptable for programming
- time and resources were adequate to allow initial automation
- the ASW School would obtain a useful product as a result of involvement in the study
- the analysis would enable a better understanding of the unique parameters of the technical training system which could be applicable to future modeling efforts in other functional areas
- the initial effort would:
  - .. provide an assessment of the utility of the automation of the scheduling process
  - .. identify additional research needs
  - .. provide an evaluation of the generality of automated scheduling programs.

The computer scheduling program developed during the study does not generate an optimized schedule for a course or group of courses. Rather, it generates a feasible schedule based on stated resource constraints and requirements. This initial iteration could be modified by training planners and individual course coordinators to accommodate the unique characteristics of course content, personnel qualifications, and equipment requirements.

The scheduling program was written in BASIC for use on a WANG 2200 programmable calculator. Figure 6 illustrates the basic inputs and outputs of the program. The program listing is given in appendix A, with schedules for the surface and submarine sonar technician courses given in appendix B. It should be pointed out that the data used to illustrate the process is not to be considered an official statement of the FLEASWTRACENPAC schedule. For instance,



not all courses are included, some course lengths have changed, and instructor levels may be different.

#### PROGRAM LOGIC

The program logic is illustrated in the flow chart of figure 7. The logic follows that of the manual process described in the previous section, which is used by the training planners at the ASW School in San Diego to assess the feasibility of a schedule. In addition, the computer program employs the same input data as that used in the manual process.

#### PROGRAM INPUT

For the purpose of illustration assume that today's date is December 1, 1977, and the schedule to be run is for the SQS-35 course in fiscal year 1979. The data required by the program for a single course is presented in table 1. Data for additional classes would be entered in the same manner.

TABLE	. 11	ADD1	DATA	FUR	LOURSE	SCHEDULING*

CIN	TITLE	PLANNED INPUT	CLASS SIZE	COURSE LENGTH	MPA	MPA ( <u>Support</u> )	LABS	SEVEN PAIRS OF CONTACT/RATIOS, CONTACT HOURS
A-130-0069	SQS-35	64	8	13	1	1	1	25/179 5/60 9/148 0/0 0/0 0/0 0/0 0/0

\*Data in table 1 is available from the NITRAS Master Course Reference File (MCRF).

#### PROGRAM OPERATION

To run the program and to generate the worksheet and course schedule the following is keyed in:

#### STEP 1

LOAD DCF 'NEW 2' (Load the program on a floppy diskette into WANG)

RUN

The CRT (screen) responds:

ENTER TODAY'S DATE (MONTH, DAY, YEAR) =





18

STEP 2

Enter 12, 1, 1977 right after the " = " sign, and press the return key.

Then the CRT responds:

ENTER FISCAL YEAR AND NO. OF COURSE

STEP 3

Enter 1979 after the word "course", push return key, and key in the following:

"A-130-0069", "SQS-35", 64, 8, 13, 1, 1, 1

25, 179, 5, 60, 9, 148, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0

STEP 4

CONTINUE OR COMPUTE (reenter step 3 for each additional course)

STEP 5

PRINT (specified input conditions, calculated values, and feasible schedule).

#### SAMPLE RESULTS

COURSE SCHEDULE WORKSHEET. A sample course schedule worksheet for ASW surface training is presented in figure 8. This worksheet provides a summary of input data and the results of calculations utilized in generating a schedule. Relevant courses are listed by CIN and short title. The scheduled planned input (SKED PLANNED INPUT) is provided by BUPERS and CNTECHTRA. The school establishes the most efficient class size for specific courses. The computer program calculates the number of classes (SKED CLASS) required to meet the planned input, how often the class is convened (CONV FREQ), and the number of concurrent convenings (C/C CLASSES). Instructor calculations are derived using CNTECHTRA Instruction 5311.1A as described previously. The worksheet also provides the training planner with support personnel figures for each course and the number of labs available. The number of labs is critical to feasibility consideration since the practical training using training devices, operational equipment, etc., is conducted in the labs. The worksheet provides for a specific fiscal year (FY) consideration but is expandable if desired. Space for specific remarks is also provided for the planner's use.

COURSE SCHEDULE. As shown in figure 9, a schedule is plotted for each course on a week-by-week basis. Courses which start 1 week before the end of the current FY and continue into the next year are considered to be current FY courses. The CIN is identified with the short title. The four digit number after each course plot indicates the FY and sequence number of the course; e.g., 7827 means 'FY 78' and the '27th' offering of that course.

Complete sample worksheets and schedules for the ASW surface and submarine sonar technician training are provided in appendix B.

	•	ASW SUP	REACE	COL	IRSE	SCHE	DULE	HOM	n X	HEET (F	(817		DATE: 12/01/77
CIN	TITLE	PLANNED INPUT	CLASS SIZE	SKED	CONV	C/C CLASSES	INST	INST	NOW	REGUIRED	ORT MPA	LABS	REMARKS
A130-0069	SE-35	64	83	80	6.25	2.08	2.27	m	-		1	1	
A130-0071	SQ6-38	ĸ	8	4	12.50	1.04	1.09	n	80		0	1	4 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8
A130-0110	SOR-17	8	8	m	16.66	0.77	1.00	N	S		'n	a	
A1 30-0120	ACOUS ANAL	20	10	1	7.14	0.84	1.83	n	m		0	0	
A1 30-0109	S06-548	12	9	n	25.00	0.12	0.21	1	1		0	0	
A130-0039	SEI	986	21	47	1.06	15.98	36.68	37	42		0	0	2 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8
A130-0037	STG-A	1170	50	65	0.84	7.08	17.14	18	23		1	1	
A130-0056	MK-111	8	10	m	16.66	1.08	3.35	4	4		N	1	1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1
A130-0057	MK-114	110	10	11	4.54	2.64	67.5	9	9		*	4	
A130-0060	MK-60	16	e	6	8, 33	0.24	0.13	1	1		0	1	
A130-0049	230-C	82	12	~	7.14	1.68	4.06	S	2		4	1	
A130-0050	LORA	32	8	4	12.50	0.16	0.19	1	0		0	0	
A1 30-0056	PAIR	16	8	nu	25.00	0.52	0.27	-	2	f	4	2	
A1 30-0044	ZEAXR	20	10	a	25.00	1.04	2.45	m	4		m	1	
A1 30-0046	ZEBX	50	10	N	25.00	0.80	2.33	m	m		m		
A1 30-0047	ZECX	80	10	8	6.25	4.16	9.75	10	12		9	n	
A130-0102	53	80	10	80	6.25	4.80	10.23	11	15		88	a	6 ) ) ) ) ) ) ) ) ) ) ) ) ) ) ) ) ) ) )
A130-0085	SHO BE/SE	120	10	12	4.16	0.95	1.10	N	4		4	1	
A130-0097	PAIR OPS	80	6	6	5.55	1.44	2.46	m	s.		4	1	
A130-0103	S40 E5	210	12	18	2.77	1.44	2.80	m	4		5		
CR	AND TOTALS	0942						118	150		Ū		

Figure 8. Sample Course Schedule Worksheet for ASW Surface Training

TAEG Report No. 52



Figure 9. ASW Surface Course Schedule Plotted on a Week-by-Week Basis

TAEG Report No. 52

(inter

21/22

#### SECTION IV

#### CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

#### CONCLUSIONS

Conclusions based on the analysis of the present system of scheduling ASW courses and the feasibility of automating this system are summarized below:

1. The scheduling problem can be classified as a combinatorial problem involving limited resource allocation.

2. An optimal schedule is difficult to establish due to:

. varying course lengths and start dates

. varying class sizes, student/instructor ratios, and contact hours

. course resource interactions and dependencies

- . the multiple resources required for each course
- . availability of resources
- . delays in resource acquisitions
- . factorial growth in problem complexity.
- 3. Conflicting scheduling objectives result in suboptimal schedules.

4. There is potential for significant savings resulting from the automation of scheduling in the form of:

- a reduction in labor to produce a feasible schedule
- reduction in AOB levels by reducing the time awaiting instruction.

5. Significant benefits can be accrued in the standardization of the scheduling process. This results in a continuity of the scheduling process with minimal disruptions due to changes in school personnel.

6. Present scheduling necessitates the commitment of classrooms for each course across blocks of time. This results in uneven utilization of classrooms, making the justification for additional classrooms difficult.

#### RECOMMENDATIONS

An analysis of the documentation of the manual scheduling process and an evaluation of the automation of this process at the FLEASWTRACENPAC lead to several recommendations.

1. Conduct a verification/validation of the automated system. This requires a practical field test and evaluation with improvements/format modifications to be undertaken in cooperation with the FLEASWTRACENPAC.

2. Conduct a cost/benefit analysis of the automated system.

3. Assess the general applicability of the automated scheduling process to other training areas. Conduct a systematic examination of potential program use at the FLEASWTRACENLANT and CNTECHTRA for ASW training. The potential applicability to other specialized training areas should be examined with the other Training Program Coordinators (TPCs) at CNTECHTRA. This analysis should examine the time and effort expended in alternate methods; i.e., manual versus automated. Opportunity costs (i.e., the loss incurred by utilizing a resource in an alternative fashion) need to be considered. This analysis must be undertaken prior to wholesale investment in automated scheduling of Navy specialized training.

4. Establish the criteria, objectives, and policies which determine the acceptability of schedules at various other activities.

APPENDIX A

PROGRAM LISTING

ういたのないのない

EST AVAILABLE COPY

REMAR DATE: " DATE: "; 21 ..... LABS ----\*\*\* ON MPA .... \*\*\* -REGUIRED ON \*\*\* NON 1 .... : ADJ INST \*\*\* ----\*\*\* 

TAEG Report No. 52

EST AVAILABLE COPY

# BEST\_AVAILABLE\_COPY

XT J1 J1<>1 THEN 1270:PRINT "(";T4(J);")" J1<>1 THEN 1280:25=0:PRINT "(;T4(J);")" INT TAB(Z5);"	111 142 142 141 141	M ***** SUBSURFACE COURSE DATA **********************************	TA *A130-0029", 'STSA CORE", 660,20,6,31,0,0 TA 25,184,8,26,5,87,0,0,0,0,0,0,0 TA #330-0188", "0A-1283", 334,10,4,0,0,1	TA 25, 13, 6, 17, 4, 87, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0 TA *A130-0189*, *800-2 0P*, 128, 8, 4, 0, 0, 0	TA 8, 16, 4, 101, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0,	TA ES. 30, 4, 120, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0 TA *A130-0027* (\$CSM(BR) 2), 130, 10, 26, 9, 0, 4 TA ES. 71.6, 104, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0	TA *A130-0172*, AUX EQUIP. 156.10,12,4,0,2 TA 25,180,6,180,0,0,0,0,0,0,0,0,0	TA "A130-0169", "BGN-17", 40, 8, 4, 2, 0, 1 TA 25, 51, 4, 60, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0	TA 25,45,4,45,0,0,0,0,0,0,0,0,0,0	TA 25, 46, 4, 36, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0	TA A130-0168', BLR-14', 50, 10, 2, 2, 0, 1 TA 25, 33, 6, 24, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0	TA *A130-0026* 806-4/4A , 16,8,18,2,0,1 TA 25, 319,4,219,0,0,0,0,0,0,0,0,0,0	TA "A130-0065", "B00-2 CMB", 53, 10, 17, 10, 0, 1 TA 12, 199, 6, 311, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0	M SURFACE COURSE DATA	TA "A130-0069", "S0S-35", 64, 8, 13, 1, 1, 1 TA 25, 179-5, 60, 9, 148, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0	TA "A130-0071", SQ5-38", 32, 8, 13, 8, 0, 1 TA 25, 207, 5, 72, 9, 103, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0	TA *A130-0110*, *SQR-17*, 20,8,13,5,2,2	TA "A130-0120", ACULS ANAL, 70, 10, 6, 3, 0, 0 TA 25, 62, 6, 123, 6, 19, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0	TA "A130-0109", "505-548", 12, 6, 3, 1, 0, 0 TA 25, 40, 3, 7, 3, 42, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0	TA "A130-0039", "SEI", 980, 21, 17, 42, 0, 0 TA 25, 356, 10, 17, 7, 80, 5, 49, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0	TA *A130-0037* STG-A, 1170, 20, 6, 23, 1, 1 TA 25, 105, 12, 6, 8, 28, 6, 38, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0	TA "A130-0056", "MK-111", 30, 10, 18, 4, 2, 1 TA 25, 143, 4, 284, 3, 105, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0	TA "A130-0057", "MC-114", 110, 10, 12, 6, 4, 4	TA PL30-0060", "M-60", 16, 3, 1, 0, 1	TA. A130-0049", 230-6", 78, 12, 12, 7, 4, 1
NEXT J IF JIC IF ZSC PRINT	Z=Z+2 NEXT J REM	HEM **	DATA 2	DATA 2	DATA 8	DATA -	DATA -	DATA -	DATA	DATA	DATA 2	DATA 2	DATA 1	REM SU	DATA -	DATA -	DATA -	DATA -	DATA -	DATA -	DATA -	DATA -	DATA	DATA -	DATA.
000 Sec.		350	0.08	4100	430	420	470	200	250	045	550	520	600	610	049	660	680	700	0211	740	1760	0811	800	830	840

### BEST AVAILABLE COPY

1850 DATA 25,148,6,102,4,102,0,0,0,0,0,0,0,0 1860 DATA "A130-0050", "LORA", 32, 8, 2, 0, 0, 0 1870 DATA 25, 32, 6, 10, 4, 6, 4, 6, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0 1880 DATA "A130-0096", "PAIR", 16, 8, 13, 2, 4, 2 1890 DATA 25, 241, 4, 11, 3, 15, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0 1900 DATA "A130-0044", "26AXR", 20, 10, 26, 4, 3, 1 1910 DATA 25, 335, 10, 3, 5, 275, 5, 12, 3, 39, 3, 89, 3, 27 1920 DATA "A130-0046", "268X", 20, 10, 20, 3, 3, 1 1930 DATA 25, 167, 5, 245, 5, 12, 3, 33, 3, 54, 3, 89, 0, 0 1940 DATA "A130-0047", "26CX", 80, 10, 26, 12, 6, 2 1950 DATA 25, 374, 5, 3, 3, 79, 5, 255, 3, 87, 0, 0, 0, 0 1960 DATA "A130-0102", "53", 80, 10, 30, 15, 8, 2 1970 DATA 25,441,5,320,3,139,0,0,0,0,0,0,0,0 1980 DATA "A130-0085", "35/38 DPS", 120, 10, 4, 4, 4, 1 1990 DATA 25,23,4,33,0,0,0,0,0,0,0,0,0,0 2000 DATA "A130-0097", "PAIR OPS", 80, 9, 8, 5, 4, 1 2010 DATA 25,111,4,104,0,0,0,0,0,0,0,0,0,0,0 2020 DATA "A130-0103", "53 OPS", 210, 12, 4, 4, 5, 1 2030 DATA 25,50,6,66,0,0,0,0,0,0,0,0,0,0 2040 END

APPENDIX B

PROGRAM OUTPUTS

				1							i		DATE: 12/01/77
NI	TITE	PLANNED	CLASS SIZE	SKED	FREG	C/C CLASSES	UNADU	INST	3	REGUIRED (	AT MPA	SBAL	REMARKS
A130-069	SE-SOS	3	83	80	6.25	2.08	2.27	m	-		-	1	
A130-0071	S05-38	æ	8	4	12.50	1.04	1.09	n	8	1	0	-	
A130-0110	SOR-17	82	8	m	16.66	0.77	1.00	2	s	1	2	n	
A130-0120	ACOUS ANAL	70	10	2	7.14	0.84	1.83	N	e		0	0	
A130-0109	SOS-548	12	9	N	25.00	0.12	0.21	1	-		0	0	
A1 30-0039	SEI	980	21	47	1.06	15.98	36.68	37	54	***	0	0	
7E00-0E1A	STG-A	1170	82	65	0.84	7.08	17.14	18	53		1	1	
A1 30-0056	MK-111	8	10	m	16.66	1.08	3.35	4	4		n		1
A1 30-0057	MK-134	110	10	11	4.54	2.64	5.79	9	9		4	4	
A130-0060	MK-60	16	m	9	8.33	0.24	0.13	1	1		0	1	
A130-0049	2-065	81	12	2	7.14	1.68	4.06	s	1		4	1	
A1 30-0050	LORA	ж	8	4	12.50	0.16	0.19	1	0		0	0	1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1
A130-00%	PAIR	16	80	N	25.00	0.52	0.27	1	a		4	a	
A130-0044	ZEAXR	20	10	'n	25.00	1.04	2.45	m	4		e	1	
A1 30-0046	268X	92	10	P	25.00	0.80	2.33	e	e		e	-	
A130-0047	Zecx	80	10	80	6.25	4.16	9.75	10	12		9	a	
A130-0102	53	80	10	80	6.25	4.80	10.23	11	15		8	a	
A130-0085	35/38 OPS	120	10	12	4.16	0.95	1.10	n	4		4	-	
7600-0E1A	PAIR OPS	80	6	6	5.55	1.44	2.46	e	s		4	1	* * * * * * * * * * * * * * *
A130-0103	53 OPS	210	12	18	2.77	1.44	2.80	m	4		s	-	
CRA	ND TOTALS	OWCE						811	150		ū		

0 THE Haum 1 COURSE SCHEDUL ASW SURFACE



p.



DATE: 12/01/77





DATE: 12/01/77







BEST AVAILABLE COPY

SHEET (FY78) MORK SCHEDULE ASW SUBSURFACE COURSE

LILE         FRANCE INVECTOR         CLASS INT         MECTO INT         CLASS INT         MECTO INT         <													DATE: 12/01/77
All 30-0023         STSA CORE         660         270         31         1.51         3.45         1.61         3.45         1.51         3.45         1.61         3.45         1.61         3.45         1.61         3.45         1.61         3.45         1.61         3.45         1.61         3.45         1.61         3.45         1.61         3.45         1.61         3.45         1.61         3.45         1.61         3.45         1.61         3.45         4.9         0         0         1           A130-01026         DDD-2         DD         128         D	CIN	בו גרב	SKED PLANNED INPUT	CLASS	SKED CLASS	CONV	CLASSES	UNADJ INST	ADJ	NO	SUPPORT REGUIRED ON MP/	A LABS	REMARKS
All and other         Signal and other <th>A130-0029</th> <th>STSA CORE</th> <th>660</th> <th>8</th> <th>33</th> <th>1.51</th> <th>3, 95</th> <th>18.48</th> <th>19.</th> <th>10</th> <th>0</th> <th>0</th> <th></th>	A130-0029	STSA CORE	660	8	33	1.51	3, 95	18.48	19.	10	0	0	
Allocolise         Inda-2 (b)         128         1         1.23         3.48         4         0         0         0         0         1           Allocolise         Inda-5 (b)         171         9         19         2.63         1.90         5.33         6         9         0         0         1           Allocolise         Inda-5 (b)         171         9         13         3.86         6.76         2.62         3         9         0         0         0         1           Allocolise         Invertiges-1         130         10         15         3.86         6.76         2.62         3         9         0         0         0         0         1           Allocolise         Invertiges-1         40         10         15         3.86         0.52         1         2         0         1         2         0         1         2         0         1	A130-0188	0A-1283	334	10	34	1.47	2.72	8.53	n	0	0		
Alboolie         Bab-5 (pe)         171         9         19         2.63         1.90         5.33         6         9         0         1           Alboolie         Bab-5 (pe)         171         9         10         13         3.8%         6.76         2.62         3         9         0         1           Alboolie         Bab+17         10         16         3.12         3.8%         5.95         6         4         0         8           Alboolie         Bab+17         40         8         5         10.00         0.30         0.562         1         0         1           Alboolie         Bab+17         40         8         5         10.00         0.30         0.562         1         0         1           Alboolie         Bab-4/via         16         8         5         10.00         0.35         0.52         1         0         1         1           Alboolie         Bab-4/via         16         8         2         2.00         0.72         1.08         2         2         1         0         1         1         1         1         1         1         1         1         1         1	A130-0183	800-2 OP	128	63	16	3.12	1.28	3.48	4	0	0	0	
Allo-OC7         GSSM(BGR-2         130         10         13         3.84         6.76         2.e2         3         9         0         4           Al3D-OU7         AUX EQUIP         156         10         16         3.12         3.84         5.95         6         4         0         2           Al3D-OU75         AUX EQUIP         156         10         16         3.12         3.84         5.95         6         4         0         2           Al3D-OU15         BGB-15         40         8         5         10.00         0.30         0.562         1         2         0         1           Al3D-OU11         BGB-15         49         8         5         10.00         0.30         0.36         0.52         1         2         0         1           Al3D-OU15         BGB-16         48         8         0.35         0.35         0.25         1         2         0         1         1         1         1         1         1         1         1         1         2         0         1         1         1         1         1         1         1         1         1         1         1	A130-0190	B00-5 0P	171	Ø	19	2,63	1.90	5.33	9	Ø	0	1	
Allo-Olite         Aux Equip         I56         10         16         3.12         3.84         5.95         6         4         0         2           Allo-Olite         Bawl T         40         8         5         10.00         0.40         0.68         1         2         0         1           Allo-Olite         Bawl T         40         8         5         10.00         0.30         0.52         1         2         0         1           Allo-Olite         Bawl T         40         8         5         10.00         0.30         0.52         1         2         0         1           Allo-Olite         Bawl T         50         10         0.20         0.35         0.52         1         2         0         1           Allo-Olite         Bawl T         50         10         5         10.00         0.22         1         2         2         0         1           Allo-Olite         Bawl T         50         10         6         8.33         2.04         4.10         5         1         1         1         1         1           Allo-Olite         Bawl T         20         2.05         1.0	A130-0027	GSSM(BOR-2	130	10	n I	3.84	6.76	2.62	m	6	0	4	
Al30-0163         BAN-17         40         8         5         10.00         0.40         0.68         1         2         0         1           Al30-0111         BG8-15         40         8         5         10.00         0.30         0.55         1         2         0         1         2           Al30-0111         BG8-15         40         8         5         10.00         0.30         0.55         1         2         0         1         2         0         1         2         0         1         2         0         1         2         0         1         2         0         1         2         0         1         2         0         1         2         0         1         2         0         1         2         0         1	A130-0172	AUX EQUIP	156	10	16	3.12	3.84	5.95	9	4	0	N	
Al30-0111         BGS-15         40         8         5         10.00         0.36         0.52         1         2         0         1           Al30-0036         BGS-8         48         8         6         8.33         0.36         0.52         1         0         0         1           Al30-0056         BGS-8         48         8         6         8.33         0.36         0.52         1         0         0         1           Al30-0056         BGG-4/4A         16         8         2         8.00         0.72         1.08         2         2         0         1         0         1         1         1         1           Al30-0056         BGG-4/4A         16         8         2         2.00         0.72         1.03         2         2         0         1         2 <td>A130-0169</td> <td>BGN-17</td> <td>40</td> <td>00</td> <td>n</td> <td>10.00</td> <td>0.40</td> <td>0.68</td> <td></td> <td>n I</td> <td>0</td> <td>1</td> <td></td>	A130-0169	BGN-17	40	00	n	10.00	0.40	0.68		n I	0	1	
A130-0036         B1GE-8         48         8         6         833         036         052         1         0         0         1           A130-0168         BLR-14         50         10         5         10.00         026         026         1         2         0.00         1           A130-0168         BLR-14         50         10         5         10.00         025         1.028         2         2         0.010         026         1         0         1         1         1           A130-0056         B00-2 CMB         53         10         6         833         2.09         4.10         5         10         0         1 </td <td>A130-0111</td> <td>B05-15</td> <td>0.4</td> <td>00</td> <td>S</td> <td>10.00</td> <td>0.30</td> <td>0.52</td> <td>1</td> <td>nj</td> <td>0</td> <td>1</td> <td></td>	A130-0111	B05-15	0.4	00	S	10.00	0.30	0.52	1	nj	0	1	
A130-0168         BLP-14         50         10         5         10.00         0.26         1         2         0         1           A130-0026         B40-4/4A         16         8         2         85.00         0.72         1.08         2         2         0         1           A130-0026         B40-4/4A         16         8         2         85.00         0.72         1.08         2         2         0         1           A130-0056         B40-2 CMB         53         10         6         8.33         2.04         4.10         5         10         0         1           A130-0071         S05-38         64         8         6.25         2.09         4.10         5         1         0         1         2         2 <t< td=""><td>A130-0036</td><td>8-308</td><td>48</td><td>60</td><td>9</td><td>8.33</td><td>0.36</td><td>0.52</td><td>1</td><td>0</td><td>0</td><td>1</td><td></td></t<>	A130-0036	8-308	48	60	9	8.33	0.36	0.52	1	0	0	1	
A130-0026         Biga-4/4A         16         8         2         85.00         0.72         1.08         2         2         0         1           A130-0065         Biga-2 CMB         53         10         6         8.33         2.04         4.10         5         10         0         1         1           A130-0065         Biga-2 CMB         53         10         6         8.33         2.04         4.10         5         10         0         1 <th<< td=""><td>A130-0168</td><td>BLR-14</td><td>50</td><td>10</td><td>u</td><td>10.00</td><td>0.20</td><td>0.25</td><td>1</td><td>nu -</td><td>0</td><td>1</td><td></td></th<<>	A130-0168	BLR-14	50	10	u	10.00	0.20	0.25	1	nu -	0	1	
A130-0065         B00-2         CMB         53         10         6         B.33         2.0%         6,10         5         10         0         1           A130-0063         S05-35         €4         8         6.25         2.0%         6,10         5         10         1         1           A130-0071         S05-35         €4         8         8         6.25         2.08         2.27         3         1         1         1           A130-010         S06-17         205         8         7         1.00         2         2         8         2         2         2         3         1         2         2	A130-0026	BGG-4/4A	16	60	nı	25,00	0.72	1.08	N	n)	0	1	
A130-0005     S05-35     E4     8     6.25     2.08     2.27     3     1     1     1       A130-0071     S05-38     32     3     1     1.01     1.03     2     8     0     1       A130-0071     S05-38     32     3     1     1.03     2     8     0     1     1       A130-010     S06-17     20     8     3     16.66     0.77     1.00     2     2     2     2     2       A130-0105     S06-548     12     7     7.19     0.84     1.83     2     3     0     0     0       A130-0105     S06-548     12     6     2     7.19     0.81     1.83     2     3     3     2     2     2       A130-0105     S06-548     12     6     7.19     0.81     1.83     2     3     3     0     0     0       A130-0035     E1     380     21     47     1.06     15.98     36.68     37     42     0     0     0       A130-0035     E1     3170     20     2     2.97     7.03     17.14     18     23     1     1     1       A130-0035	A130-0065	BOG-2 CMB	es	10	ġ	8.33	2.04	4.10	ß	10	0	1	
A130-0071     S05-38     32     8     4     12.50     1.04     1.03     2     8     0     1       A130-0110     S08-17     20     8     3     16.66     0.77     1.00     2     5     2     2     2       A130-0120     S08-17     20     10     7     7.19     0.84     1.83     2     3     3     2     2     2     2       A130-0120     S08-548     12     6     7     7.19     0.84     1.83     2     3     3     2     3       A130-0109     S05-548     12     6     7     7.19     0.84     1.83     2     3     42     0       A130-0033     E1     980     21     47     1.06     15.98     36.68     37     42     0     0     0       A130-0037     STG-A     1170     20     50     50.71     7.09     17.14     18     23     1     1       A130-0056     M-111     30     10     3     1.03     3.35     4     4     5     1	A130-0069	50S-35	64	65	50	6.25	2.08	2.27	m	1	1	1	
A130-0110       SDR-17       20       8       3       16.66       0.77       1.00       2       5       2       2         A130-0120       ACOUS ANAL       70       10       10       7       7.19       0.34       1.83       2       3       3       2       2       2         A130-0120       ACOUS ANAL       70       10       7       7.19       0.34       1.83       2       3       3       2       2       2       2       2       2       2       2       2       2       2       2       2       3       3       3       3       3       3       3       3       3       3       3       4       1	A130-0071	S05-38	32	89	4	12,50	1.04	1.09	nu	60	0	1	
A130-0120     ACUS ANAL     70     10     7     7,19     0.84     1.83     2     3     0     0     0       A130-0109     S35-548     12     6     2     25,00     0.12     0.21     1     1     0     0     0       A130-0039     S25-548     12     6     2     25,00     0.12     0.21     1     1     0     0     0       A130-0037     STG-A     1170     20     59     2,1     7,03     17.14     18     23     1     1     1       A130-0056     MK-111     30     10     3     16,46     1.03     3.35     4     4     2     1     1	A130-0110	SOR -17	30	00	m	16.66	0.77	1.00	N	ហ	N	N	
A130-0109 535-548 12 6 2 25,00 0.12 0.21 1 1 0 0 0 A130-0039 5E1 980 21 47 1.06 15.98 36.68 37 42 0 0 A130-0037 5TC-A 1170 20 59 2.57 7.09 17.14 18 23 1 1 1 A130-0056 MK-111 30 10 3 16.66 1.08 3.35 4 4 6 2 1	A130-0120	ACOUS ANAL	20	10	1-	7.14	0.84	1.83	N	m	0	0	
A130-0033 SEI 980 21 47 1.06 15.98 36.68 37 42 0 0 A130-0037 STC-A 1170 20 59 21 7.03 17.14 18 23 1 1 1 A130-0056 MK-111 30 10 3 16.66 1.03 3.35 4 4 2 2 1	A130-0103	SQS-548	12	ġ	nj	25,00	0.12	0.21	-	1	0	0	
A130-0037 576-A 1170 20 59 2.44 7.03 17.14 18 23 1 1 1 A130-0056 MK-111 30 10 3 16.66 1.03 3.35 4 4 2 2 1	A130-0039	SEI	086	51	47	1.06	15,98	36.68	37	42	0	0	
A130-0056 MK-111 30 10 3 16.66 1.03 3.35 4 4 2 2 1	A130-0037	STC-A	0211	50	55	2.14	7,03	17.14	18	53	1		
	A130-0056	MK-111	30	10	n	16.66	1.08	3* 35	+	4	N	1	

40

TAEG Report No. 52

GRAND TOTALS

4204

## 127

158



R. W





43



DATE: 12/01/77 FY79 (WEEK) 0000000001111111111112222233333344444446000000011111111122222 1234567290123456789012345678901234567890123456789012345678901234578901234 (1081) (1082) ASN SUBSURFACE COURSE SCHEDULE .. (2082)\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\* \*\*\*(7806) \*\*(7805) (5082)\*\*\*(7805) \*\*\* \*\*(1804) FY78(WEEK) (E082)\*\* · \*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\* (1801) (2082)\*\* (1084)\*\* .. COURSE (800-5-008), (800-5-008) A170-0055 (800-9/063) A130-0069 (\$05-35) A130-0168 (PLP-1A) A130-0071 A130-0036

TAEG Report No. 52

Press.

45

BEST AVAILABLE

COPY



DATE: 12/01/77

TAEG Report No. 52

46



47

BEST

COPY

DATE: 12/01/77





COPY

TAEG Report No. 52

49/50

#### APPENDIX C

#### INDUSTRIAL SCHEDULING METHODOLOGY AND ITS APPLICATION TO NAVAL TRAINING

5.0

1

1

3

.

1

To schedule is to make a timetable for activities. While our interest is in making a timetable for offering Navy training courses using available resources, initially the scheduling problem appears to be not too different from those encountered in setting industrial production schedules. Consequently, the scheduling methodology used in industry may be applicable to the scheduling of training courses. This section will present how production scheduling is done in industry and then single out concepts and techniques which may be useful for the scheduling of Navy training courses.

#### INDUSTRIAL SCHEDULING METHODOLOGY

In an industrial production system, the variables subject to control are, fundamentally, labor, materials, and capital inputs. More labor effort will theoretically generate more volume of output, so the employment level and use of overtime are highly relevant. Materials can also be used to regulate the flow of output by studying and depleting inventories, backordering, and subcontracting items to other firms. In addition, the capital input represents a variable controlling the overall plant capacity in a longer-range sense.

Figure C-1 depicts the major interrelationships of the industrial production planning and scheduling activities. A production plan is a statement of production goals, based on forecasts of demand and resource availability, that consciously attempts to manage employment and inventory levels to attain organizational objectives. The master schedule flowing from the production plan is a high-level schedule that translates the production plan into specific product terms by specifying what end products are to be produced and the time periods during which they are to be made. From the master schedule are derived the component inventory and scheduling requirements. The detailed schedule is a low-level schedule specifying precisely what must be produced and the starting and/or completion dates.

Not all industrial firms perform the same production control functions. Indeed, there is a striking difference between the production control activities in continuous, intermittent, and project-type operations.

ASSEMBLY LINE BALANCING. Continuous systems are designed to produce large volumes of a single item (or relatively few items) on specialized, fixed-path equipment. They often utilize assembly lines (e.g., the automotive industry, television producers) or continuous-processing equipment (e.g., oil refineries). Raw materials and component parts are common to each unit produced, labor operations are repetitive, and the transformation technology used is the same in each case. Scheduling in this mode of production system consists of establishing the rate of flow of raw materials and subassemblies to the line, balancing the capacities of workers and machines along the line, and smoothing the flow and shipment of items off the line. This type of problem is called the assembly line balancing problem.

Figure C-2 is a network representation of assembly line balancing with seven work elements. The network shows how the end product is put together. For example, work element 5 is not processed until elements 2 and 4 are completed.



•

the set



Figure C-1. Major Interrelationships of the Industrial Production Planning and Scheduling Activities

The number adjacent to each node is the time required for the work element. This type of problem attempts to determine the best grouping of work elements for workstations such that the processing time for each workstation is as uniform as possible.

![](_page_55_Figure_2.jpeg)

Figure C-2. Network Representation of a Line Balancing Problem

The assembly line balancing problem is one of the combinatorial problems which has been proved to be frustrating to deal with, and no optimum algorithm has been developed to solve it. For an assembly line with 70 work elements (nodes in the network) and 105 precedence relations (arcs), an estimate of the number of feasible sequences is  $70!/2^{105} = 10^{65}$ . It would take years to find the optimal solution even with the fastest computer presently available. Arcus (1966), Kilbridge and Webster (1961), among others, have proposed heuristic procedures to obtain a good schedule for the line balancing problem.

JOB SHOP SCHEDULING. The second mode of production is intermittent systems which are designed to produce small quantities of many items on relatively general purpose equipment. More specifically, a number of jobs, each comprising one or more operations to be performed in specified sequence on specified machines and requiring certain amounts of time, are to be scheduled such that due dates associated with each job will be met or, failing this, some measure, such as the sum of lateness times, is minimized. Such a problem is called the job shop scheduling problem.

Like the assembly line balancing problem, the job shop scheduling problem is a difficult combinatorial problem. Normally, the solution method is to lay out all possible sequences and then pick the best. Despite the power of

modern computers, such a method is not feasible for any real-world problem. For J jobs and M machines, in the general case there will be  $(J')^{M}$  such sequences. A small problem with 5 jobs and 5 machines, for example, would have approximately 2.5 X  $10^{10}$  sequences to evaluate.

In the past two decades there has been a substantial growth in the field of job shop scheduling research. However, no exact optimum algorithm has been found, and, in fact, research results indicate the optimal solution for the job shop scheduling problem is computationally difficult to obtain. Thus, numerous simulation studies are made to see which heuristic scheduling rules are best. For example, the shortest-job-first rule has been shown to be rather favorable in some cases. In a recent paper by Panwalker and Iskander (1977), a list of over 100 scheduling rules is given according to different categories. The scheduling rules are presented in a form that can be readily used by both practitioners and researchers. Conway, Maxwell, and Miller (1967) and Baker (1974) also provide a detailed account of job shop scheduling rules.

PROJECT SCHEDULING. The third mode of production is large-scale one-time project systems. Projects usually consist of multiple parts and components and involve huge labor hours, dollars, and equipment requirements. Such complexity makes project scheduling of extreme importance, since operations performed out of schedule can cause delays and extra costs. Problems concerning the control and coordination of projects are called the project scheduling problem.

Since the late 1950s, the critical path method (CPM) of scheduling has been used to sequence project activities so that the project completion is minimized. The method provides a knowledge of permissible slack or schedule slippage of certain activities. This slack in the schedule gives management flexibility in achieving the schedule.

Like the assembly line balancing problem, project scheduling problems can be represented by a network. Figure C-3 shows the network representation of a project containing six activities: A, B, C, D, E, and F. The network depicts the logical relationships, and the number adjacent to each arc is the time duration for the activity. For example, activity F cannot be started until D and E are completed. The dashed line 3-4 is a dummy activity of zero duration, used for correct logic in some situations. In this example, activities A, B, D, and F are critical ones. An excellent coverage of the CPM is found in Moder and Phillips (1970).

![](_page_57_Figure_0.jpeg)

![](_page_57_Figure_1.jpeg)

The basic CPM assumes unlimited resource availabilities. In some situations, one may desire to complete the project by a specified due date while utilizing resources at a relatively constant rate. Thus, the objective of the leveling process is to smooth as much as possible the demand for each specific resource during the life of the project. This is accomplished by judicious rescheduling of activities within their available slack to give the most acceptable resource constraints. This type of problem is called the unlimited resource leveling problem.

In some situations, however, the unlimited resource assumption is invalid. One may be given fixed amounts of resources during each period of project duration. When the amount available are not sufficient to satisfy demands of concurrent activities, sequencing decisions are required, often resulting in some increase in total project completion time. Thus, the scheduling problem here is to meet project due dates as much as possible, subject to stated constraints on available resources. This is called the limited resource allocation problem.

While the basic critical path schedule can be optimally determined rather easily, finding an optimal schedule for projects with resource constraints is as difficult as that for line balancing and job shop scheduling problems. Heuristic scheduling rules seem to be the only promising way in large realworld problems. Burgess and Killebrew (1962) described a simple procedure based on minimizing the sum of squares of resource requirements in consecutive time periods to deal with unlimited resource leveling. Levy, Thompson, and Wiest (1963) proposed an approach of setting "trigger levels" of maximum resource usage and attempting to smooth resources to fall within these levels.

During our visit with the Pacific ASW School, two observations were made. Utilization of resources appeared unleveled. For instance, it was observed that classrooms were likely to be used for 20 hours in a week, 60 hours in the following week, 40 hours following that, and then 80 hours. The second observation made was that the existing scheduling procedure did not seem to consider minimization of trainees' waiting time for courses. The existing course schedules are laid out uniformly distributed throughout the year. If the number of classes needed is greater than the number of weeks available in the year, double shifts are made and uniformly distributed again.

It is believed that some modifications to the existing course scheduling procedure may result in a more level resource utilization and reduced AOB level. The first suggestion is that the idea of resources leveling, as described earlier, be incorporated. The second suggestion is that course schedules be generated with consideration to the AOB level.

A number of heuristic procedures have been proposed for the limited resource allocation problem. Davis (1973) provides an excellent overview and classification of contributions to the project scheduling field up to 1973. Wiest (1967) developed a computer program called Scheduling Program for Allocating Resources (SPAR). His procedure is based on two scheduling rules: the activity with the least slack is scheduled first and the one with the shortest time duration is scheduled first if two activities with the same slack are eligible for scheduling. The program has been applied to single and multiple project problems of more than 200 jobs and 20 different resource types. Other important papers in the development of this subject are written by Fendley (1968), Cooper (1976), and Thesen (1976).

Table C-1 summarizes industrial scheduling problems and solution techniques. All in all, industrial scheduling problems comprise a class of difficult combinatorial problems. This class of problems is characterized by a factorial growth in the amount of computation required to consider all possible solutions as problem size increases. However, there are strong similarities among some of these problems, to the extent that solution procedures developed originally for one type problem have been applied on the other, with considerable success. This cross application of solution procedures is one of the important developments in this field.

#### APPLICATION TO NAVAL TRAINING

The Naval course scheduling problem does not appear to resemble the three basic types of industrial scheduling problems as reviewed earlier. Although training a student may be viewed as assembling a car, the nature of the scheduling problem in an assembly line, mainly, desiring the smoothing of product flow by grouping of work elements, is not nearly the same as that of course scheduling. In a job shop environment, job shop scheduling rules are intended to resolve conflicts of the cross-utilization of expensive machinery and/or high-skilled labor. Some similarities exist between courses and jobs and between training resources (instructors, trainers, and facilities) and job shop machinery. Cross-utilization of training resources, however, does not seem to exist at the Pacific ASW School; instructors and trainers are seemingly dedicated to the respective courses.

Initially, project scheduling with resource constraints was thought to be an excellent modeling technique for the Naval course scheduling problem. It was thought that an enlisted trainee completing some NEC skill came close to accomplishing a project with interrelated course requirements. Based on this thinking, course schedules with a reduced AOB level and leveled resource utilization could have been developed by employing project scheduling techniques reviewed earlier. It turned out that interrelationships among courses were rather simple; namely, one following another. For example, to be rated in 26 BX maintenance, one must take the basic core course (6 weeks), self-paced Basic Electricity and Electronics (6 to 9 weeks), Sonar Electronics Intermediate (17 weeks), and then 26 BX maintenance (20 weeks). This simplicity nullifies the powerfulness of project scheduling techniques. TABLE C-1. SUMMARY OF INDUSTRIAL SCHEDULING PROBLEMS AND SOLUTION TECHNIQUES

#### BIBLIOGRAPHY

Arcus, A. L. "COMSOAL: A Computer Method of Sequencing Operations for Assembly Lines, I - The Problem in Simple Form, II - The Problem in Complex Form." In E. S. Buffa (Ed.) <u>Readings in Production and Operations Management</u>. New York: 1966.

Baker, K. R. Introduction to Sequencing and Scheduling. New York: Wiley. 1974.

- Burgess, A. R. and Killebrew, J. B. "Variation in Activity Level on a Cyclical Arrow Diagram." Journal of Industrial Engineering. March-April 1962. 13 (2).
- Coffman, E. G., Jr. (Ed.). <u>Computer and Job Shop Scheduling Theory</u>. New York: Wiley. 1976.

Conway, R. W., Maxwell, W. L., and Miller, L. W. Theory of Scheduling. Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company. 1967.

Cooper, D. F. "Heuristics for Scheduling Resource - Constrained Projects: An Experimentation Investigation." <u>Management Science</u>, 22 (76), 11 (July). 1186-1194.

- Davis, E. W. "Project Scheduling Under Resource Constraints Historical Review and Categorization of Procedures." <u>AIE Transactions</u>. December 1973. 297 - 313.
- Dyer, J. S. and Mulvey, J. M. "An Integrated Optimization/Information System for Academic Departmental Planning." <u>Management Science</u>, 22 (76), 12 (Aug). 1332 - 1341.
- Erschler, J., Roubellat, F., and Vernhes, T. P. "Finding Some Essential Characteristics of the Feasible Solutions for a Scheduling Problem." <u>Operations</u> <u>Research</u>. July-August 1976. 24 (4).
- Fendley, L. G. "Toward the Development of a Complete Multiproject Scheduling System." Journal of Industrial Engineering. 1968. 19 (10). 505-515.
- Fromovitz, S. and Gass, S. J. The Scheduling of Submarines for Fleet Operations Support. Working Paper. March 1976. University of Maryland.
- Helgeson, W. B. and Birnie, D. P. "Assembly Line Balancing Using the Ranked Positional Weight Technique." <u>Journal of Industrial Engineering</u>. 1961. 12 (6).
- Kilbridge, M. D. and Webster, L. "A Heuristic Method of Assembly Line Balancing." Journal of Industrial Engineering. July-August 1961. 12 (4).
- Levy, F. K., Thompson, G. L., and Wiest, J. D. "Multi-Snip, Multi-Shop, Workload Smoothing Program." <u>Naval Research Logistics Quarterly</u>. March 1963.

#### BIBLIOGRAPHY (continued)

Moder, J. J. and Phillips, C. R. <u>Project Management with CPM and PERT</u>. (2nd ed.) New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold Co. 1970.

O'Brien, J. J. Scheduling Handbook, New York: McGraw-Hill. 1969.

Panwalker, S. S. and Iskander, W. "A Survey of Scheduling Rules." Operations Research. January-February 1977. 25 (1). p. 45.

Thesen, A. "Heuristic Scheduling of Activities Under Resource and Precedence Restrictions." Management Science. 1976. 23 (4). 412-422.

Wiest, J. D. "A Heuristic Model for Scheduling Large Projects with Limited Resources." <u>Management Science</u>. February 1967.

#### DISTRIBUTION LIST

#### Air Force

Headquarters, Air Training Command (XPTD, Dr. D. E. Meyer) Headquarters, Air Training Command (XPTIA, Mr. Goldman) Air Force Human Resources Laboratory, Brooks Air Force Base Air Force Human Resources Laboratory (Library), Lowry Air Force Base Air Force Office of Scientific Research/AR (Dr. A. R. Fregly)

#### Army

Commandant, TRADOC (Technical Library) ARI (Dr. Ralph R. Canter, 316C; Dr. Edgar Johnson) ARI Field Unit - Leavenworth

#### Coast Guard

Commandant, U.S. Coast Guard Headquarters (G-P-1/62; G-RT/81)

#### Marine Corps

CMC (Code OT) CGMCDEC (Mr. Greenup) Director, Marine Corps Institute

#### Navy

ASN (R&D) (Dr. S. Koslov) ASN (MRA&L) (Dr. B. D. Rostker)					
CNO (OD 09707 CAPT Connerv: OP-0018	м	Malehorn.	0P-087P10	Dr P	Smith.
$OP_{-987}$ H Stone)		na renorm,	01-307110,	DI. K.	. Juit city
NAVCOMPT (Code NCD-7)					
ONR (Code 458, 455)					
ONRBO Boston (J. Lester)					
ONRBO Chicago					
ONRBO Pasadena (E. E. Gloye)					
CNM (MAT-03424, Mr. A. L. Rubinstein)					
CNET (01, 00A, N-5 (6 copies))					
CNAVRES (Code 02)					
COMNAVSEASYSCOM (03, 047C1, 047C12)					
COMNAVAIRSYSCOM (03, 340F)					
CNET SUPPORT (00, 01A)					
CNTECHTRA (0161, Dr. Kerr (5 copies))					
CNATRA (F. Schufletowski)					
COMTRALANT					
COMTRALANT (Educational Advisor)			1		
COMTRAPAC (2 copies)			1		

(Page 1 of 2)

#### DISTRIBUTION LIST (continued)

Navy (continued)

CO NAVPERSRANDCEN (Library (4 copies)) NAVPERSRANDCEN Liaison (Code 01H) Superintendent NAVPGSCOL (Code 2124) (Code 556) Superintendent Naval Academy Annapolis (Chairman, Behavioral Science Dept.) CO NAVEDTRAPRODEVCEN (AH3) CO NAVEDTRASUPPCEN NORVA CO NAVEDTRASUPPCENPAC (5 copies) CO NAVAEROMEDRSCHLAB (Chief Aviation Psych. Div.) CO FLTCOMDIRSYSTRACENPAC CO NAMTRAGRU CISO, NTTC Corry Station CO NAVTRAEQUIPCEN (N-131 (2 copies), N-211, N-OOAF, N-OOM, PM TRADE) Center for Naval Analyses (2 copies) U.S. Naval Institute (CDR Bowler) OIC NODAC (Code 2) CO TRITRAFAC (2 copies) CO NAVSUBTRACENPAC (2 copies)

#### Other DOD

Military Assistant for Human Resources, OAD (E&LS) ODDR&E (COL Henry Taylor) OASD (I&L) - WR (LT COL Grossel)

Director, Human Resources Office, Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency (R. Young)

Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency (CTO, Dr. H. F. O'Neil, Jr.) Institute for Defense Analyses (Dr. Jesse Orlansky)

Non-DOD

Essex Corporation (Dr. John Collins)

Information Exchanges

DDC (12 copies) DLSIE (James Dowling) Scientific Technical Information Office, NASA Executive Editor, Psychological Abstracts, American Psychological Association ERIC Processing and Reference Facility, Bethesda, MD (2 copies)

(Page 2 of 2)

![](_page_65_Picture_0.jpeg)