

AD-A093 086

ARMY COMMAND AND GENERAL STAFF COLL FORT LEAVENWORTH KS F/G 5/9  
DOES CGSC PREPARE THE AIR FORCE OFFICER FOR HIS FOLLOW ON ASSIG--ETC(U)  
JUN 80 P V HESTER

UNCLASSIFIED

SBIE-AD-E750 044

NL

1 of 1  
AD A  
36086


END  
DATE  
FILMED  
2-81  
DTIC

AD-E 750 044

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE (When Data Entered)

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE		READ INSTRUCTIONS BEFORE COMPLETING FORM
1. REPORT NUMBER	2. GOVT ACCESSION NO.	3. RECIPIENT'S CATALOG NUMBER
	AD-A093086	
4. TITLE (and Subtitle)	5. TYPE OF REPORT & PERIOD COVERED	
DOES CGSC PREPARE THE AIR FORCE OFFICER FOR HIS FOLLOW ON ASSIGNMENT?	6JUNE 1980	
	6. PERFORMING ORG. REPORT NUMBER	
	8. CONTRACT OR GRANT NUMBER(s)	
7. AUTHOR(s)	10. PROGRAM ELEMENT, PROJECT, TASK AREA & WORK UNIT NUMBERS	
HESTER, PAUL V., MAJOR, USAF		
9. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME AND ADDRESS	12. REPORT DATE	
STUDENT AT THE U.S. ARMY COMMAND AND GENERAL STAFF COLLEGE, FORT LEAVENWORTH, KANSAS 66027	6 JUNE 80	
11. CONTROLLING OFFICE NAME AND ADDRESS	13. NUMBER OF PAGES	
U.S. ARMY COMMAND AND GENERAL STAFF COLLEGE ATTN: ATZLSW-DC-MS	50	
14. MONITORING AGENCY NAME & ADDRESS (if different from Controlling Office)	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)		
APPROVED FOR PUBLIC RELEASE; DISTRIBUTION UNLIMITED.		
18. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES		
MASTER OF MILITARY ART AND SCIENCE (MMAS) THESIS PREPARED AT CGSC IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE MASTERS PROGRAM REQUIREMENTS, U.S. ARMY COMMAND AND GENERAL STAFF COLLEGE, FORT LEAVENWORTH, KANSAS 66027		
19. KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number)		
PROFESSIONAL MILITARY EDUCATION (PME) INTERMEDIATE SERVICE SCHOOL (ISS) COMMAND & GENERAL STAFF COLLEGE (CGSC) AIR COMMAND & STAFF COLLEGE (ACSC)		
20. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number)		
see reverse		

AD A 093086

DTIC ELECTED  
DEC 19 1980

DDC FILE COPY

**LEVEL III**

This study attempts to determine if CGSC prepares the Air Force officer for the responsibilities and tasks he will encounter in his next assignment. The investigation focuses on an analysis of the curriculums of CGSC and ACSC; impressions of the 1979-80 Air Force students; and a survey of the experiences of the two previous classes of the Air Force students.

The investigation revealed that the answer is not a clear cut yes or no. But instead one that is dependent upon a variety of factors. The officers surveyed offered numerous suggestions for curriculum changes to improve the Air Force officer's education at CGSC. These were consolidated and presented as recommendations. (author)

Accession For	
NTIS GRA&I	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
DTIC TAB	<input type="checkbox"/>
Unannounced	<input type="checkbox"/>
Justification	
By _____	
Distribution/	
Availability Codes	
Dist	Avail and/or Special
<b>A</b>	

(6) Does CGSC Prepare the Air Force Officer for his Follow  
On Assignment?

(10) [Paul V./Hester], Major, USAF  
U.S. Army Command and General Staff College  
Fort Leavenworth, Kansas 66027

6 June 1980

Approved for public release; distribution unlimited.

A Master of Military Art and Science thesis presented to  
the faculty of the U.S. Army Command and General Staff  
College, Fort Leavenworth, Kansas 66027

DOES CGSC PREPARE THE AIR FORCE OFFICER  
FOR HIS FOLLOW ON ASSIGNMENT?

A thesis presented to the Faculty of the U.S. Army  
Command and General Staff College in partial  
fulfillment of the requirements for the  
degree

MASTER OF MILITARY ART AND SCIENCE

by

Paul V. Hester, Major, USAF  
B.B.A., University of Mississippi, 1969  
M.B.A., University of Mississippi, 1970

Fort Leavenworth, Kansas  
1980

MASTER OF MILITARY ART AND SCIENCE

THESIS APPROVAL PAGE

Name of candidate Paul V. Hester

Title of thesis Does CGSC Prepare the Air Force

Officer for His Follow On Assignment?

Approved by:

Barry P. Bridger, Thesis Committee Chairman  
LTC B. B. Bridger M.A.

Joseph R. Bream, Member, Graduate Faculty  
Major J. R. Bream M.A.

Donald D. Schaffer, Member, Consulting Faculty  
LTC D. D. Schaffer Ph.D.

Accepted this 11th day of June 1980 by Philip J. Brookes,  
Director, Graduate Degree Programs.

The opinions and conclusions expressed herein are those of the student author and do not necessarily represent the views of the U.S. Army Command and General Staff College or any other governmental agency. (References to this study should include the foregoing statement.)

DOES CGSC PREPARE THE AIR FORCE OFFICER FOR HIS FOLLOW  
ON ASSIGNMENT?, by Major Paul V. Hester, USAF, 50 pages.

This study attempts to determine if CGSC prepares the Air Force officer for the responsibilities and tasks he will encounter in his next assignment. The investigation focuses on an analysis of the curriculums of CGSC and ACSC; impressions of the 1979-80 Air Force Students; and a survey of the experiences of the two previous classes of Air Force students.

The investigation revealed that the answer is not a clear cut yes or no. But instead, one that is dependent upon a variety of factors. The officers surveyed offered numerous suggestions for curriculum changes to improve the Air Force officer's education at CGSC. These were consolidated and presented as recommendations.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
ABSTRACT.....	iii
LIST OF TABLES.....	v
CHAPTER	
I. INTRODUCTION.....	1
Background.....	1
Purpose.....	4
Constraints.....	4
Review of Literature.....	5
Research Design and Organization.....	6
II. CGSC CURRICULUM.....	7
Air Force Pre-course.....	8
Regular Course.....	9
Instructional Methods.....	10
Core and Elective Curriculum Breakdown.....	12
III. ACSC CURRICULUM AND COMPARISON.....	16
Instructional Methods.....	18
Core Courses.....	19
Course Goals.....	19
Tailored Instructional Program.....	25
CGSC/ACSC Comparison.....	28
IV. SURVEY RESULTS.....	30
Educational Comparison.....	30
Current Class Findings.....	36
Previous Two Class Findings.....	38
V. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....	44
Conclusions.....	45
Recommendations.....	46
Recommendation for Future Study.....	47
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	49



LIST OF TABLES

	PAGE
1. Educational Comparison of Air Force Students	32

## CHAPTER I

### INTRODUCTION

#### BACKGROUND

The early United States military did not have a centralized organization to formulate training objectives and had to depend on the local commander to recruit and train his forces. The fate of this army in battle rested, most often, on the individual ingenuity of the field commander. If he studied the recorded battles of history and learned their lessons or spent a large portion of his time developing tactics and analyzing the terrain, then he entered the field of conflict prepared for the task. Often, this was not the case. In addition to a few ill prepared field commanders, the Army in the late 1800's found itself expanding and discovering new technologies for warfare. The need arose for a system of uniformly educating Army officers in tactical operations. In 1881, General Sherman established the School of Application for Infantry and Cavalry at Fort Leavenworth, Kansas. The school has steadily grown and altered its emphasis from strictly operational matters to a combination of field command and staff duties. (16:4-5)

The National Security Act of 1947 set the Air

Force apart and separate from the Army. (14:2-3) The Air Force brought with it many lessons already learned by the Army concerning organization and education and in 1946, the Air Command and Staff School began operation at Maxwell Air Force Base, Alabama. Similar to its Army "cousin", the school has evolved through transition to become an integral part of the three-tiered education system of Air University. (2:1,14)

The end of World War II and the need for strong world leadership pushed the United States to assume an ever increasing role of responsibility. Military officers stationed worldwide found new challenges in jobs requiring both knowledge of international issues and professional military skills. The importance of professional education was given another boost.

In 1945, General Dwight D. Eisenhower remarked that World War II experiences showed that most victorious operations resulted from a combined arms effort of two or three services operating under a unified command. (14:2-5) The leaders of such commands must possess a degree of knowledge of the subordinate components to weld their power effectively. The services saw the need to broaden the horizons of selected officers by sending them to sister service professional schools. This provided these few the opportunity to study indepth the procedures and operations of a different service. This program currently exists in varying degrees amongst all

services; however, the largest participants are the Army and the Air Force.

During the 1960's and the early 70's, the Army and Air Force grew larger because of Vietnam. During this period, officers who attended sister service schools and missed their service's education could easily be returned to the fold with combat tours or special jobs. The end of our participation in Vietnam signaled a drastic reduction in the size of both the Army and the Air Force. Couple this with the ever increasing technological modernization of both services and we find an esclating demand that all officers be fully competent, aware of, and able to assume the responsibilities of his service. It must be assumed that in-service professional education is developing its officers for the increased tasks. However, the question must be raised as to whether the current Army-Air Force exchange program is meeting the needs of the respective service.

Before an answer can be found, a broad look at the objective of both colleges would be helpful. The Command and General Staff College (CGSC) mission is

"...to provide instruction for officers of the Active Army and Reserve components, worldwide, to prepare them for duty as field grade commanders and principal staff officers at brigade or higher echelons." (16:iii)

CGSC is dedicated to equipping the Army field grade officers with the knowledge and skills necessary to win the land battle.

The Air Force, on the other hand, has a different objective in its training of officers. The Air Command and Staff College (ACSC) mission is to provide officers with

"...the skills, knowledge and understanding that will enhance their value to the Air Force for the balance of their careers in responsible command and staff positions; to conduct student and faculty research of value to the Air Force..." (3:1)

Like the CGSC mission, these goals are very parochial in their thinking, but both are correct in their inward looking design.

Other than the larger, horizon-broadening benefit of the exchange program, both services desire to have the daily contact and exchange of ideas and knowledge between "blue" and "green" suiters.

#### PURPOSE

The purpose of this study then is to answer the question, "Does CGSC prepare the Air Force officer for his follow on assignment?" The information uncovered will be of benefit to both the Air Force and the Army either through support of the current program or recommendations for change to the curriculum to insure a positive answer.

#### CONSTRAINTS

The Army, like any institution, modifies its objectives periodically to meet changing demands. As a

part of that process the course curriculum at CGSC has evolved over the years with emphasis shifting between departments. Therefore, to achieve a hard look at a relatively stable program, the focus will be on the school years 1977-78, 1978-79, and 1979-80.

#### REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The CGSC Library; CGSC Abstracts of Master of Military Art and Science (MMAS) Thesis and Special Reports; the Air University Abstracts of Research Reports and Index to Military Periodicals; and the Defence Documentation Center files were searched for unclassified research papers on Professional Military Education (PME). In addition, the General Accounting Office (GAO) in Washington; the Directorate of Curriculum, ACSC; and the Air Staff Office of Military Professional Education (MPPE) were contacted for documents relating to the research or analysis of the Intermediate Service Schools (ISS).

This research revealed a large volume of information relating to PME. The subject of the studies included course critiques; course engineering; history of PME; shallow analyses of the Air Force or Army education system; and the desirability of Distinguished Graduate (DG) programs. However, no studies were discovered to have any applicability to this research.

## RESEARCH DESIGN AND ORGANIZATION

In Chapter II the author begins the research with an in-depth look at the CGSC curriculum and its emphasis. This analysis is then compared to the stated College mission and draws a conclusion as to the effectiveness of the school to meet its goal. The next chapter focuses attention on the ACSC curriculum and mission, and then points out areas of similarities/differences between the two schools.

In Chapter IV the author turns to the human aspect of the thesis question. The Air Force students at CGSC during the three focus years are compared by looking at their civilian and military educational levels. A survey of the current class (1979-80) is taken to determine their attitudes on the thesis question. Then for comparison, the two previous year groups are surveyed for their input based on their follow on job experiences. Suggestions for curriculum improvement are also included. The conclusions and recommendations are found in Chapter V.

## CHAPTER II

### CGSC CURRICULUM

In answering the thesis question, we must first discover the knowledge expected of both the CGSC and ACSC graduate. Therefore, in this chapter the author will review, analyze, summarize, and interpret the CGSC curriculum for its emphasis and ability to complete the College's objectives.

The Regular Course is conducted over forty-one weeks beginning during the first week of August and ending the first week of June. Eligibility for United States officers is restricted to those who have been promoted to Major (there are always several Lt. Colonels in the class), have less than 15 years of active commissioned service and have successfully completed a branch officer advanced course.

Since the school does have Allies from about 50 countries and officers from the three sister services who may be unfamiliar with the U.S. Army, it conducts an Allied Officers Preparatory Course during the three weeks immediately preceding the start of the Regular Course. During this time, these officers study U.S. Army organization and doctrine, become familiar with the Army related military terminology, and receive a very shallow



introduction to each academic phase that will be encountered in the coming year.

Completely separate from this preparatory course, the Air Force officers arrive at Fort Leavenworth not later than the end of June which is three weeks earlier than the preparatory course. During this time, the Air Force staff at the College provides course work of a broad, general nature that should enhance the ability of the officer during the year. The writing course provides the student the opportunity to write typical Air Force letters/staff correspondence, critique other students' work, and in a group discussion review and rewrite several examples of poorly written material. The final part of this course is a research paper in which an argumentative position is explained and supported within the constraint of 1000 words. In addition to improving writing skills, this Air Force course concentrates on increasing the officer's ability to express his thoughts clearly and concisely both with a prepared text and under extemporaneous, "on-your-feet" conditions. In preparation for the voluminous reading requirement for the Regular Course, the Time-Life Speed Reading course is required for all Air Force students. This is offered during the Regular Course but, only, to selected Army officers

To fill out and broaden the officer's knowledge base with which to answer pertinent questions concerning

Air Force policy and doctrine during the year, the staff provides three detailed briefings. The first is presented by an officer from the Air Staff and explains the current programs and changes in Air Force doctrine. The majority of the interface between the Air Force and the Army concerns the use of tactical airpower. Therefore, the second briefing is given by a member of the Tactical Air Command (TAC) briefing team and explains the current mission of TAC, the resources available to perform the mission and the plans devised to accomplish that mission. The last briefing is designed to update the officers on current personnel policy and the procedures that will be used to assign the Air Force officers after graduation. An officer from the Air Force Military Personnel Center (MPC) is invited to present this briefing which then completes the Air Force preparatory course.

The Regular Course is divided into three Terms. Term one is the longest, and runs from the first of August until the third week of December. Following the Christmas break the second term runs from the first of January until the middle of March. Then the third and last term extends until the last of May.

The course work during the year has been divided into two sections, core requirements and elective courses. The core requirements offer the knowledge and skills desired by the College for each student to have. The elective courses, on the other hand, allow the student to select with the approval of his academic counselor, those

courses that will best benefit him and further prepare him for his next assignment. This elective approach is possible because the Army Military Personnel Center (MILPERCEN) tries to provide the bulk of the assignments before the end of term one and registration for electives in term two and three.

Each year the exact courses that appear in the core and elective curriculum is a result of a survey of the tasks performed by CGSC graduates at their follow on assignments. These tasks are obtained by the CGSC validation curriculum survey and the TRADOC officer job task analysis program. These findings are further broken down into common and advanced tasks and are translated to core and elective courses respectively.

The College has adopted a variety of instructional methods to present the material. The lecture-conference method is used to take advantage of the subject expertise of the platform instructors. To help insure quality of the instructors, each must have completed CGSC in residence before being assigned as a teacher. To take advantage of the varied backgrounds of the students, small discussion groups are used with one of the students usually as the lesson moderator. Selfpaced, non-contact instruction is used to allow students to progress individually with factual or procedural material. Simulation is the last method used which allows the students to combine those theories and doctrines learned in the

classroom and apply them in a real world problem. Each method of instruction has been married to the individual lessons and the desired learning objectives.

The courses which were derived from the tasks mentioned above are organized according to type and divided between six departments. These are the Department of Command (DCOM), Department of Resource Management (DREM), Department of Tactics (DTAC), Department of Unified and Combined Operations (DUCO), Combat Studies Institute (CSI) and the Director of Graduate Degree Programs.

Participation in the Graduate Degree Program is voluntary and thus is not a requirement for CGSC graduation. However, it plays a significant role in the educational process of the College. Through this directorate, the student can be enrolled in one of four degree granting programs. The Master of Military Art and Science (MMAS) allows the Regular student to earn a graduate degree while in residence at the College. The degree can be tailored to meet three military specialties or a non-specialist option. The other three options involve regular civilian university course work. Contract and non-contract courses provide the student with college credits but usually, requires completion of the degree during off duty time. Students selected by MILPERCEN can enroll in the Cooperative Degree Program.

A graduate degree is conferred at the end of this program which concludes with six months residency at the civilian university.

During the 192 academic days, the core curriculum covers 763 hours of work. All students are required to take the entire core curriculum. During terms two and three each student is required to take a total of seven electives. These electives account for 210 academic hours and are spread over the 105 academic days. The emphasis of the school, therefore, is built around the core courses which comprise 78% of the total academic load while the elective courses consume the other 22% of the college curriculum.

DCOM teaches 15 core courses totaling 252 hours and 33% of the core schedule. These courses are divided into two major areas. The first segment, staff operations, is made up of five courses and concentrates on the inter-relation of the commander and his staff, organization and tactics of Soviet forces, special weapons and concludes with a course that draws together the knowledge from all departments in a tactical command and control exercise. The other segment of the DCOM curriculum deals with the day to day management of the Army with studies in training management, public affairs, military law/ethics, and the reserve components as a part of the total Army. The Air Force section teaches its own courses in both personnel and training management; therefore, the Air Force

students are excused from these Army courses. DCOM offers 16 of the 71 elective courses or 23%. Like all electives, they take some portion of the core curriculum and expand the subject to provide the student a greater base of expertise.

The DREM is allocated 127 hours or 17% of the core course. The two major areas are management and combat service support (CSS). During the management portion, the officers study basic management techniques and resource management concepts used by the Army to manage its money, material and personnel. CSS is the largest portion of DREM and concentrates on supporting the tactical operation. DREM offers 16 elective courses or 23% of the College total.

DTAC has the responsibility of teaching the officers how to win the land battle. Through 193 hours in seven courses, they cover all maneuver elements, combat support, additional combat service support, and the relationship of tactical air to the land battle in very general terms. The course is broken into an offensive and defensive setting with the problems of each examined in depth. Their core courses comprise 25% of the total while their 13 elective courses take 18% of the optional study.

It would be difficult to find any comprehensive course of study that did not include a look at the foundation of its system. The CSI provides the officers the

doorway for looking into the past and studying the development of the profession of arms through battles, technology and politics. This department is unique in that it has a permanent civilian professor who lectures and instructs in military history throughout the year. As would be expected, CSI only offers 24 hours or 3% of the core course while its 9 electives comprise 13% of the instruction.

The previous four departments tend to be narrow in their field of study; however, DUCO has its focus on a broader base. Through its strategic studies area, officers delve into the strategic environment and examine issues that help formulate the policies of the United States and other countries. It is also in this department that joint, special and contingency operations are investigated. The largest portion of the department study, low intensity conflict, is offered as a balance to DTAC's concentration on the large land battle in Europe. DUCO's instruction is balanced between the 160 hours, 21%, in the core study and the 17 courses, 24%, in the elective program.

By delving into the interstructure of each of the department's courses, 483 hours of the core instruction fall out as being directly related to the task of winning the land battle. This equates to 63% of the base knowledge the College desires of its graduates. How does this statistic measure against the school's mission?

If we review the method in which the College constructs and rewrites its curriculum, and then decides the content of core and elective courses, we can provide some insight to the answer. In the case of each department, the core curriculum to elective ratio is inverse. That is if the core content is high then the elective content will be low, and the reverse is also true. For example, DCOM has 33% of the core instruction and only 23% of the elective program. This indicates the College wants a higher base of understanding amongst all graduating officers in DCOM subjects. But in CSI, the desired base knowledge only takes 3% of the core while the knowledge expanding elective courses comprise 13% of the total. The high core content expressed in DCOM, DTAC, and to a lesser degree in DUCO points out the College's emphasis and desired learning base of its graduates. Therefore, it can be seen that this base is directly related to the College mission and supports their goal of preparing field grade commanders and staff officers at brigade and higher echelons. (16)



## CHAPTER III

### ACSC CURRICULUM AND COMPARISON

The previous chapter examined the CGSC curriculum, matching the school mission statement with the courses actually being taught. In this chapter, the author will compare the ACSC curriculum with the school mission as stated in Chapter I. The final portion of this chapter will then compare the two schools and look for both similarities and points of departure.

The Air Command and Staff College has one class a year which runs for 40 weeks between the middle of August and first week of June the following year. The Class size including students from the sister services and the Allied officers is approximately 540 students. Eligibility for the Air Force officers is determined by the Air Force Military Personnel Center and is tied to the officer's selection to temporary Major. All officers promoted to Major each year are eligible for consideration by the PME intermediate school board which meets immediately after the Major promotion board. Their charter is to select those officers promoted in the secondary zone and the best qualified from the primary zone who have demonstrated the potential for assignment to key field grade command and staff positions. These officers

are then programmed to attend school during the next four years. Their school assignments are determined by the Intermediate Service School Designation Board which meets in November each year at MPC.

The school does have Allied officers in attendance and offers a separate course to prepare them for their academic year. There are three eight-week courses taught during the year and can accommodate a total of 159 officers. During this time the Allies concentrate on spoken and written English, become familiar with the techniques of instruction used in the College, study the United States organization for its national defense and attend an informational program which acquaints them with most aspects of American life that they will encounter during the academic year.

The course work for ACSC is basically divided into two categories, core requirements and a Tailored Instructional Program (TIP) requirement. The core courses concentrate on those common skills and knowledge that the College desires each graduate to possess. Conversely, the TIP program provides a detailed course of study to participating officers in a particular field.

ACSC has a simple but thorough process by which it reviews and updates its curriculum annually. It is guided by ACSC Regulation 53-2 and is essentially a closed loop process in that it can receive inputs any time

during the year. These inputs are automatically considered during the planning sequence. The cyclic process does not prevent immediate changes to the course since each suggestion is reviewed on its own merits and judged as to required annual or immediate implementation. There are many sources of inputs to the planning cycle. These include the school commandant, Air Staff, Air University Fifteen-Year Plan, Board of Visitors, faculty, phase evaluations, and students. Student inputs take the form of critiques, surveys, and interviews with graduates at their follow on assignments. All of the inputs are then categorized and compared with the school mission and goals. Only then are the suggestions broken down into courses and learning objectives formulated.

The College employs 15 instructional techniques to present its courses; however, many of these are slight variations of a basic method. Therefore, only the main methods will be discussed. The lecture/seminar method provides the instructor the time to draw from his expertise on the subject and teach his section new material or introduce a relatively common topic for discussion. To be qualified as a platform instructor, an officer must attend a five week Academic Instructor School (AIS) at Maxwell Air Force Base to help develop the proper skills needed to transfer information to the student.

One of the most important methods of learning is

through the guided discussion period. This technique allows a small group of officers to study a problem or discuss a position using the on-the-job knowledge gathered from their various backgrounds. This technique provides time for officers to be actively involved in their own learning process. The panel discussion method, on the other hand, provides a group of instructors with various expertise a forum which facilitates in-depth learning of special subjects. The final method of instruction is the exercise mode, either manual or computer supported, which allows the officers to apply the theories taught in the class to a notional problem.

The core courses that emerge from the curriculum development process are tailored to accomplish the desired learning in one of four areas of instruction. The areas are matched to four divisions that are responsible for the content during that phase of the course. These are the Staff Communications and Research Division; the Command and Management Division; the Military Environment Division; and the Military Employment Division. The chairman of each division is charged to have his courses support specific course goals so that the combined product of the four departments satisfies the school mission.

The course goals are divided into six areas and are shown below.

Common Staff Skills:

1. To further prepare staff officers to reason

logically, solve problems effectively, communicate clearly, and organize effectively for executive decision.

2. To develop an understanding of the organization, policies, and programs through which the Air Force functions.

3. To develop field grade officer leadership and management skills.

Specific Staff Skills:

4. To develop Air Command and Staff graduates with skills for employing aerospace forces against the background of historical and contemporary perspectives on warfare.

Specialist Skills:

5. To expand an officer's knowledge of a functional speciality and increase his aptitude, insights, and analytical skills within that discipline. This in-depth instruction must serve to increase an ACSC graduate's effectiveness within his area of specialization and reduce the transition time required in his next assignment.

Broaden Knowledge of the Air Force:

6. To develop and emphasize knowledge consistent with action officer, mid-level supervisor, and unit command responsibilities.

Broaden View Beyond the Air Force:

7. To develop an understanding of the world environment as it affects the Air Force officer's knowledge and application of skills and to increase his sensitivity to the national security process.

Research:

8. To research, document findings and provide insights and recommendations to the DOD/Air Force on functional topics.

Area 1 in the curriculum is handled by the Staff Communications and Research Division. These courses are further divided into four separate phases that support

the department's goals. Phase 1 covers 35 hours of instruction and is titled Fundamentals of Effective Staff Communications. During this phase the instruction focuses on the total communication process and specifically stresses reading, listening, and non-verbal communication. A speed reading course is taught as well as practical exercises which concentrate on platform speaking and staff editing of written communications. The second phase comprises 18 hours and although titled Air Staff Scenario is really a refined application of the principles learned in the first phase. The class work centers on practicing the variety of communicative tools available to a staff officer including the summary sheet, message, military letter, background paper, talking paper and memo for record. Phase 3 is composed of 25 hours that are allocated to the other departments to support their core courses. The last phase is the longest and is dedicated to the Research program. These 215 hours are designed for practical research which may take the form of individual/group studies, articles, papers, curriculum projects and theses. These four phases in Area 1 are allocated 268 academic hours which comprise 24.2% of the College's instruction and supports the first, second and eight course goals.

There are also four phases in the Area 2 instruction titled Command and Management. Phase 1, comprising 50 hours, deals with the fundamentals and techniques that managers and leaders need for interpersonal relationships

and problem solving. Specific teaching points involve stress, management by objectives, time management, teamwork, leadership, managing conflict and group problem solving. The second phase, Command and Leadership, encompasses the nature of the profession, the attitudes of the people, and the policies/programs available to the Air Force leader to complete his task. The 60 hours of study delve into the history of the profession, look at the roles of the officers and the NCO, review the programs available through the social actions office, teach the military justice system and the Air Force personnel system. During the 50 hours of phase 3, the students concentrate on the Air Staff and the analytical processes that lead to Air Force decisions. Specifically, the instruction centers on administrative procedures of the Air Staff, statistical sampling and its application, the use of economic analysis in the defense of decision making, and an introduction to the value of computers. Phase 4 instruction is extremely important to understanding the operation of the Air Force budget. The 80 hours dedicated to Resource Management involve analyzing the systems acquisition process, logistical support, and the Planning, Program and Budgeting System from the base level through the Air Staff. The 241 hours allotted to Area 2 constitutes 21.8% of the academic instruction and cover course goals one, two, three, four, six and seven.

Area 3, Military Environment, is the shortest of the four core academic areas and is, therefore, only divided into two separate phases. The main theme of this area is to investigate the parameters which shape the use of the military force as an instrument of the United States policy. Phase 1 lays the foundation by examining the current international environment, democracy vs other forms of government, foreign policy objectives, and the foreign policy formulation process. The final phase uses this base knowledge to study each area or region of the world and assesses through case studies the role the United States military should play in foreign policy with a particular country. The division has taken the 109 academic hours, 9.8% of the course, allotted to its instruction and molded it to support course goals two, four, and seven.

The last of the four core areas is the application portion of the course and is appropriately called Military Employment. It is divided into four phases: Military Strategy and Doctrine; Strategic Planning and Operations; General Purpose Forces; and Joint Operation Planning. Phase 1 is the common denominator that will provide the thread to run through each of the other phases and show the commonality amongst them. It compares Soviet and United States doctrines; details land, sea, and air strategy; discusses the evolution of ideas, concepts and doctrine; and points out the challenges and



constraints to our national strategies. The second phase focuses totally on strategic planning and operations, and concentrates on our nuclear triad. The end of this phase culminates with a study of the threat and employment of our nuclear forces in a nuclear war simulation called "Big Stick." Phase three basically accomplishes the same program except the attention is given to the general purpose forces. The conventional fighting forces of the Army, Navy, Marines, Air Force and our associated Reserves/National Guard are inspected to understand their individual roles and missions. Naturally, the heaviest emphasis is on the complete understanding of the United States Air Force's mission. The final part of this phase looks at the operation of these forces in the various theaters of possible conflict and their interaction with local conventional forces. Having studied the forces of our sister services, it is a natural extension to learn how they combine their assets and function in a joint operation. Phase four explains the development of the Joint Operation Planning System (JOPS), its internal operation and finishes with a practical exercise to develop a joint task force and deploy it to meet the designated threat. This area completes the core instruction and its 269 hours fulfills 24.3% of the course while supporting course goals one, two, three, four, six, seven and eight.

At the completion of the four core areas of instruction the students move into the TIP tracks. This concept was devised by ACSC to help overcome our environment of diminishing resources. It is designed to increase the graduate's effectiveness within his area of specialization and reduce the transition time required in his follow on assignment. Each of the five TIP tracks involves 112 academic hours or 10.1% of the total academic year. They concentrate on command, logistics, acquisition, theater or strategic specialities.

The intent of the Theater Operations Speciality Tract is to prepare ACSC graduates for assignments to line and staff positions in the European and Pacific theaters. The track concentrates on the organization in those theaters, the threat and his possible employment options, our daily peacetime operations and our plans to defeat the enemy in the event of war. A theater warfare exercise emphasizing the combined operations problems facing the commander and his staff draws together the students' knowledge from the core and track courses, and concludes this speciality.

The Strategic Plans and Operations Speciality is an indepth extension of the Area 4, phase 2 portion of the core curriculum. Its purpose is to equip officers with the ability to comprehend and analyze the issues that impact on strategic operations at all levels. The track begins with a history of strategic warfare and the

continuing need to improve and shape its capabilities. Other parts of the track include a study of the various systems available to the strategic planner; his considerations for employment; and the issues/problems facing the commander during a nuclear conflict. The culmination of the track is a field trip to Strategic Air Command Headquarters to view first hand the operations and problems discussed during the track.

The techniques of being a squadron commander in the Air Force are learned by observation rather than acquired by practice at different levels of command. Therefore, it is logical that ACSC should devote a complete speciality track to the practical knowledge required and delve into the specifics. During this track the courses cover the spectrum of situations facing a commander from the relationship of his squadron with the wing to discipline to the function of the military wife. The conclusion of the track is a series of case studies in which students must derive a satisfactory solution as if they were the commander.

The Logistics track is unique in that the majority of the material taught has not been introduced in the core curriculum. The scope of the track is very broad and is built around two phases. The first is a supply customer course which delves deep into every aspect of the operation of the supply system including policy, procedures and current/future operations. The second phase is a

three week material management course. This course helps expand the knowledge for supply and procurement personnel being assigned to an Air Force Logistics Command job, or those officers who will hold staff jobs above the wing and will be required to communicate daily with all levels of material management.

The last TIP track piggy-backs with phase 4 of Area 2 and advances the officer's knowledge of weapon systems acquisition. The course design is to provide a strong foundation, study the total acquisition process, and analyze the interface required between all parties, military and civilian, for a successful program.

Now that the ACSC curriculum has been dissected and reviewed, what can be deduced about the value of the course? By studying the ACSC mission statement it is difficult to determine the desired qualities of a graduate. However, since the College has gone one step further and broken the mission down into eight separate course goals, the evaluation process is easier.

Each of the four core Areas has been given the charge to structure their courses to satisfy specific course goals which keeps the divisions focused on the desired product. Since the thrust of the mission involves staff work or command positions and the course goals guide the course development, it is therefore logical that 88% of the core curriculum is almost equally divided amongst

Areas 1, 2 and 4. The TIP tracks are then natural extended courses of study for the Air Force's most desired specialities. This information forces the conclusion that the process of course design and curriculum review insures that the subjects taught support the College's goals. (3)

Through chapter two and three both the Army and the Air Force's intermediate service school curriculum vs mission have been scrutinized. Since both schools focus on the mid-career officer there are some similarities; however, there are also several differences. The most important points of both groups are listed below.

Similarities:

1. Both school curriculums support their respective mission statement.
2. Both schools give only cursory looks at sister services and their programs/problems.
3. Several similar courses including the history of warfare, rise of professionalism, national strategy, and the Joint Operational Planning System are taught at each school.
4. Instructional methods in the two colleges are relatively the same. However, the degree that each method is used varies considerably.

Differences:

1. Selection of officers for attendance is different not only in methodology but also in requirements.
2. Allied officers graduate three months early at ACSC and complete the same course as United States officers at CGSC.
3. ACSC platform instructors are required to

complete AIS before instructing while there is no comparable course for CGSC instructors.

4. The ACSC elective program is structured to desired Air Force speciality tracks while the CGSC program is individually designed by the student.

5. Tactical courses at the colleges concentrate only on the respective service's employment concepts.

6. The CGSC class is nearly twice the size of the ACSC class.

There is no attempt to show that one school is better than the other, but only to point out that the designs of the colleges are different; the courses are drastically apart in subject and method of coverage; and that both schools are accomplishing their respective missions.

## CHAPTER IV

### SURVEY RESULTS

In the past two chapters the curriculums of the two schools have been reviewed and thus sets the knowledge base for the school graduate. This base, as we have seen, accomplishes the stated missions of the respective schools but says nothing of the applicability of that knowledge to the follow on assignment. Therefore, in this chapter the human element of the research circle will be explored. The current Air Force students were polled to see what their perceived answer was to the thesis question. Then through the process of interviews with the Air Force members of the past two classes, their experiences and impressions of the ability of CGSC to prepare them for their assignment was accumulated. However, before the answers are consolidated, another important factor which could have considerable impact on the results will be investigated.

The formal education of the Air Force students, other than that received at CGSC, can have a biasing influence on their answers to the thesis question. Therefore, to see what the pre-CGSC educational base was an indepth comparison of the Air Force students' military and civilian education for the three focus years will be made.

Table 1 shows the breakout of the three individual classes. For comparison, the students are divided into rated and non-rated groups. Then tabulations are made for the number in each group that have completed the categories of ACSC, a Masters degree, and those that have completed both. Within each category there are three numbers. The first in the line represents the raw number of Air Force students in each category. For example, in the 1977-78 class there were 20 rated officers who have completed ACSC. The second number denotes the percentage that the raw number is of the total Air Force students in the horizontal group (rated, non-rated, or total). Using the same example as above, the figure shows that of the 31 rated Air Force students 20 or 64.5% have completed ACSC. The final number indicates the share that rated or non-rated officers have of the total students in a vertical category. To complete the example, of the 27 students who have finished ACSC, 20 or 74.1% of them are rated.

For a comparison of the three years, the first of the two percentages offers a better analysis and will therefore receive the majority of attention. Generally, it can be seen that for all categories listed across the top, the percent of rated and non-rated officers participating has increased each year. It is also significant to note that the non-rated percent is higher than the rated percent in every case except ACSC for the 1979-80



EDUCATIONAL COMPARISON OF AIR FORCE STUDENTS (1)

	# of AIR FORCE STUDENTS	ACSC	MASTERS	ACSC & MASTERS
1977-78				
RATED	31/100%/77.5% *	20/64.5%/74.1%	16/51.6%/66.7%	11/35.5%/64.7%
NON-RATED	9/100%/22.5%	7/77.8%/25.9%	8/88.9%/33.3%	6/66.7%/35.3%
TOTAL	40/100%/100%	27/67.5%/100%	24/60%/100%	17/42.5%/100%
1978-79				
RATED	34/100%/85%	20/58.8%/80%	21/61.8%/80.1%	14/41.2%/77.8%
NON-RATED	6/100%/15%	5/83.3%/20%	5/83.3%/19.9%	4/66.7%/22.2%
TOTAL	40/100%/100%	25/62.5%/100%	26/65%/100%	18/45%/100%
1979-80				
RATED	26/100%/81.3%	22/84.6%/81.5%	20/76.9%/76.9%	17/65.4%/77.3%
NON-RATED	6/100%/18.8%	5/83.3%/18.5%	6/100%/23.1%	5/83.3%/22.7%
TOTAL	32/100%/100%	27/84.4%/100%	26/81.3%/100%	22/68.8%/100%

\*Note: The first percentage refers to the percent of Air Force students in the horizontal group (RATED, NON-RATED, TOTAL).  
 The second percentage refers to the percent of the TOTAL in the vertical category (ACSC, MASTERS, etc.).  
 Example: 1977-78 RATED, ACSC 20/64.5%/74.1%; 64.5% =  $\frac{20}{31}$  ; 74.1% =  $\frac{20}{27}$

TABLE 1

class. There are two possible reasons for this statistic. In each class the non-rated officers comprise a much smaller portion of the total students in comparison with the rated officers. This small number means that one non-rated student has a greater impact on his group percentage than does his rated counterpart. However, the more important reason stems from working conditions and hours. Although not absolute, non-rated officers in grades O-1 through O-3 work a regular duty period of eight hours. On the other hand, the rated officer does his desk work either before or after flying and is generally pushed into a duty period of 10-12 hours. In addition to the longer work hours, the duty period fluctuates widely from week to week. The result of this is that the non-rated officer usually has more stable off duty time in which to enroll in the various categories. (1)

Over the three years, rated officers increased in ACSC completion. However, there was a slight decrease in the second year followed by a sharp rise in the 1979-80 year. Under the Masters category, they have experienced a steady increase in all three years. In the final category, the progression was very gradual between the first two years but dramatic between the second and third years. The conclusion to draw is that the rated officer at CGSC has greatly increased his educational level in both military and civilian studies from the first to the third year. (1)

The non-rated officer has also enjoyed a general increase in participation in the three categories. For ACSC completion, there was a small increase in the second year followed by the same level in the third year. This group experienced a decrease in the Masters category in the second year but turned the trend upward to 100% in the final class. In the combined category, the first two years showed a steady percentage with a jump to 83.3% in the 1979-80 year. In all three categories, 66.7% is the smallest participation by the non-rated group. Their three year profile shows an increase in all the categories, but the degree is small because the beginning percentage was already high. (1)

The rated and non-rated individual study is important to see the trends in the two different types of Air Force officer since they can occupy extremely different jobs upon graduation. However, the composite look is equally important for the detailed study but becomes the most important figure for the quick glance.

The first item that surfaces is that the 1979-80 class is 20% smaller than the previous two years. The only significance is that the smaller sample slightly impacts the percentages in the same way the addition or deletion of one non-rated officer affected those figures. The ACSC category is the only one to experience a decline in the second year. But this was immediately followed by a significant rise in the third class. The rise in

the non-rated percentage was more than offset by the rated decrease in that second year. For the civilian Masters, the upward trend has been steady and ends with a high participation of 81.3%. The greatest growth comes in the combined category. Following two years of slight progression, the third class increased involvement by 23.8%. (1)

If the last two years are compared and expressed as a percentage using the second year as a base, the results show that the third year class' participation took a quantum leap in military and civilian education. ACSC rose 35%, the Masters increased 25%, and the combined category jumped an incredible 52%. (1)

There are points to be absorbed from this comparison of the three classes. The first is that all three classes were civilian and militarily well educated before attending CGSC. Secondly, there has been an increase in participation in all categories from the first to third year. And lastly, the third year class' statistics show a significant increase from the previous two years. This fact is important in our ability to project the findings the 1979-80 class will have when they reach their follow on assignments.

There were three other categories considered, but the results had no effect. All of the Air Force students held a bachelor degree, and all except three of the 112 students had completed Squadron Officers School (SOS).

The only significance to be found with SOS is that the current class is the only one of the three that has a 100% completion rate. The last category not used involves PME above the intermediate level and in this particular case meant the Industrial College of the Armed Forces (ICAF). The past two classes showed an increase from 15% to 27% in the number that had completed the course. However, during the mid-70s the Air Force changed the eligibility requirements for enrollment to preclude all officers under the rank of Major. The effects of that decision can be seen in the current class as only one officer or 3% has completed the course. (1)

During the September to November 1979 period, informal discussions were held with the members of the 1979-80 class. The talks centered on the courses then currently being taught and the impressions of their usefulness during their next assignment. It was not surprising to find that the majority of the Air Force students felt that the courses were not applicable to what they would be doing in their next job. This narrow view, made in the early part of the academic year, is understandable from the standpoint of the curriculum. The courses of the core curriculum taught in those months were building blocks for the remainder of the year and involved many subjects that were completely foreign to the Air Force officer. The emphasis, as shown in Chapter II, was on Army field operations to which Air Force officers

are not assigned or usually involved with. (11)

It was only logical to reaccomplish this informal survey in the latter part of the year with the same group and note any differences, if any, plus their suggestions for change. The combined attitude of the class had altered considerably from the fall to the March-April period. The impression now was that although every course is not directly applicable to the next assignment, the composite learning experience of broadened horizons is directly transferable and of great benefit to problem solving for the field grade officer. There were, however, several suggestions advocated, not to drastically modify the curriculum, but instead to further the learning experience of all officers in the course. (13)

The most common concern shared by these officers was in the combined arms operations area of the offense and defense tactical courses. The Air Force instructors are asked to teach general concepts for tactical and strategic airpower as an overview. However, they are not tasked to teach detailed application of airpower to the specific courses of action studied in the classrooms. Therefore, all the students are deprived the knowledge of how the Army and Air Force work together to accomplish ground objectives. They believe that the Air Force students should be more actively involved with the instruction of their service's ability to support the Army and influence the land battle. It was also suggested that the

idea for separate Air Force courses for personnel management and training management should be retained. The last major area of change involves having selected representatives from the Major Commands and the Air Staff come to the school and update the students on current operations and policy/doctrine changes. An alternative to this is for the Air Force students to travel to the various headquarters to receive the briefings or have some combination of the two. (13)

The complete answer to the thesis question is impossible to find by merely talking with the students currently in the course. Therefore, the Air Force students from the other two focus years were surveyed to determine their feeling as to the CGSC applicability to their job. The interview with the contacted students was free flowing to take advantage of the varied backgrounds and the wide variety of jobs to which the former students were assigned. After an explanation of the reason for the interview and the purpose of the paper, the first question always asked of each officer was, "Did CGSC prepare you to accept the responsibilities and tasks associated with your follow on assignment?" Next, we explored the reasons why the answer was either positive or negative. And finally, regardless of the answer, we discussed what changes could be made to better prepare the officer for his next job.

The answers were as varied as the number contacted;

however, a definite trend did develop. Therefore, for ease of compilation and presentation, the answers are broken into six separate categories related to job position. These are Pentagon, Military Airlift Command (MAC), Strategic Air Command (SAC), Tactical Air Command (TAC), United States Air Forces Europe (USAFE), and Direct Army Related (DAR).

The Air Staff at the Pentagon represents the highest level to which an Air Force CGSC graduate could be assigned and should require the broadest of horizons to perform those jobs and be effective. Officers on the Air Staff were unanimous in saying yes. In addition to the Joint Chiefs of Staff (JCS) officers, the Air Staff jobs require a great amount of work in the joint arena. It was their opinion that CGSC gave them a proper foundation for working at that level under joint conditions. As should be expected, the major change requested by this group was for a more extensive course on the Joint Operational Planning System (JOPS). Other suggestions centered on an increased emphasis on all types of writing and the Planning, Programming and Budgeting System (PPBS). (12)

The answers from MAC came from officers at the headquarters as well as pilots flying the transport aircraft. Regardless of the diversity of these two types of jobs, all officers in MAC responded yes. The officers believe that a great percent of their daily business involves planning or executing the movement of Army troops



and equipment. The knowledge of how and why the Army operates a particular way enables the planner and the pilot to provide their sister service a better product. Their ideas for change primarily pointed toward an expansion of the JOPS course and the need for Air Force writing. (12)

SAC provided the first negative reply in the survey. After consideration, the answer was really quite obvious. All officers felt that the education at CGSC was good and broadened their horizons but did not apply to their jobs. SAC has a unique job involving strategic planning and warfare. Even though they are capable of conventional war with their aircraft, the mission takes them beyond the direct support of the Army soldier at the Forward Edge of the Battle Area (FEBA). Therefore, SAC is rarely directly involved with the Army in its daily operations. Because of this disparity in missions, the officers could offer no major changes that could be implemented at CGSC. They did see the need for more practice with Air Force writing and "on-your-feet" presentations. It should be noted that the answer given by the SAC officers is to some degree slanted by the lack of nuclear warfare taught at the College. It could be reasonably expected that the response would be altered if the school incorporates this type of study into the curriculum. (12)

TAC provides the fighter aircraft to directly

support the troops on the front lines and attack the enemy to assist the Army in seizing its objectives. Consequently, the reply from this group proved to be, initially, the most puzzling of the six groups. The answers came from officers at the headquarters and fighter pilots flying at the operational bases. This division of jobs is reflective of the respective no and yes answers. None of the officers at the headquarters has any regular contact with the Army since their jobs involved "putting out brush fires" on daily TAC problems or planning for future TAC hardware requirements. A case could be made here that a staff officer properly educated in Army operations would be valuable on the TAC staff in writing joint plans or preparing hardware to support the Army. Converse to the staff officers, the operational pilots felt the Army education gave them a better understanding of the operation they were supporting and enabled them to prepare their training missions to match what they could realistically expect to find on both sides of the FEBA during war. The officers at the headquarters stated they needed more work with Air Force written requirements and personal briefings. They also voiced a requirement to keep abreast of the changes in TAC policy and operations plus a strong desire for an Air Force oriented training management course. The operational pilots main concern was the lack of instruction on the integration of the Air Force in winning the land battle. While the answer from TAC is valid,

it should be pointed out that the majority of jobs requiring coordination with the Army were not occupied by graduates in the focus years and thus not covered in the survey. (12)

The CGSC tactical instruction concentrates primarily on scenarios in the central region of NATO. Consequently, it comes as no surprise that the majority of officers in USAFE believe the school prepared them well for their mission in Europe. In addition to the courses, the association with the Allied officers gave them a better perspective of the cooperation and coordination required not only for inter-United States services but also for inter-NATO forces. Their stated deficiencies and needs are practically mirror images of those related by TAC. (12)

The last and easiest group of graduates to survey were those assigned to jobs that had a daily direct contact with the Army. Their answer was an obvious and unanimous yes. These officers were the best prepared to assume their follow on jobs but still voiced a desire for additional instruction in Air Force writing. These were the best informed officers on Army-Air Force plans and operations, and as such, realized that the instruction in the College, out of necessity, will lag behind the current world. (12)

One last question, not involving CGSC or changes to the course, was asked of each officer. All personnel were surveyed on the impact that ACSC, a Masters or the

combination had on their answer or the performance of their job. Unless the Masters degree was in a field that related directly to the current job, it had no impact. However, the side benefits of personal discipline and research fundamentals encountered in securing the degree were all transferable to the job. There was considerable disagreement as to the measure of value of the non-resident ACSC course, but it was generally believed that the writing requirements and broad brush coverage of the Air Force helped fill in some of the gaps in the CGSC course. Considering the two previous responses, it is understandable that the officer holding the combination enjoys significant synergistic benefits.

(12)

## CHAPTER V

### CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The Air Force and the Army have long recognized the necessity to exchange students at their respective intermediate service schools. This spawns better understanding and cooperation for the unified command and the joint task force to accomplish their mission. However, severe force reductions in the 1970s have caused us to take a closer look at the exchange program and desire to derive maximum benefit from its participants.

The purpose of this study was to examine Air Force participation at the U.S. Army Command and General Staff College and investigate whether CGSC prepared the Air Force officer for his follow on assignment.

In pursuing the research, the first area to be reviewed was the mission statements of both CGSC and ACSC. The curriculums were then scrutinized for their ability to support the stated missions. With the knowledge of what is desired of the graduates, the attention was then focused on the human feed-back element of the study. The educational profiles of the three focus years were compiled and compared for any significant trends. The last part of the investigation was a series of interviews with the current class of Air Force officers and the members of the two previous graduated classes.

## CONCLUSIONS

Bases on an analysis of the findings of the above research, the author offers the following conclusions:

1. The answer to the thesis question is not a black and white yes or no. Instead, it is dependent on the assignment level and type of job.
2. The jobs held by the past two classes cover the breadth of the Air Force and should be monitored closer.
3. Both the CGSC and ACSC curriculums support the respective college's mission.
4. There is a lack of emphasis on the total air-land battle during the tactical courses.
5. The need exists for specific Air Force related courses.
6. There is a writing deficiency for the Air Force officers in the CGSC curriculum. However, this does not imply that this deficiency is greater or less than the ACSC graduate.
7. Non-resident ACSC completion is beneficial to the Air Force officer in the follow on assignment.
8. The research fundamentals and personal discipline of a Masters degree, as a minimum, are helpful to the Air Force officer.
9. Based on their increased educational background and the findings of the previous classes, the 1979-80 class should derive considerable benefit from CGSC.

## RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the above conclusions, the following items should be considered to better prepare the Air Force officer at CGSC for his follow on assignment:

1. CGSC should institute a heavier emphasis on the total air-land battle in its tactical courses.
2. The CGSC curriculum should include permanent "Blue Goose" lectures assigned to Air Force students during the tactical courses to cover their service's participation in the air-land battle.
3. MPC should provide the follow on assignments as early as possible but not later than 15 December. This will allow the Air Force officer to align his elective program with the work he can expect after graduation.
4. MPC should consider assigning only follow on assignments that will derive direct benefit from the CGSC graduate.
5. Retain the Air Force pre-course on speed reading and Air Force related writing.
6. The Air Force section should develop a one week mini-course on Air Force writing to be taught outside the college curriculum during April or May. This will provide an excellent review before graduation with concentration on areas to be encountered in the next assignment.

7. The Air Force section should highly encourage participation in the MMAS program with concentration on Air Force related topics.
8. Retain the idea of a separate Air Force Training Management course.
9. Retain the idea of a separate Air Force Personnel Management course.
10. Provide updates on current operations and policy/doctrine changes from all Major Commands and the Air Staff. The time for the briefings should be provided for within the college curriculum as "Air Force Update" and not held outside the school umbrella. In addition, the briefings should be held during terms two and three.
11. The Intermediate Service School Board should consider using the non-resident ACSC course as a prerequisite for CGSC attendance.

#### RECOMMENDATION FOR FUTURE STUDY

The conclusions derived in this research stimulated the above recommendations for change but did not address their implementation if they are accepted. Before several of the items are used, additional research would assist in the smooth introduction into the course.

The first area of study should concentrate on the adequacy of the CGSC library to support with "on-hand" material Air Force related research topics and lectures



by the Air Force students. Since several of the recommendations point out tasks to be accomplished by the Air Force section, a review of the number of required Air Force faculty instructors at CGSC should be completed. And last, if CGSC is willing to take the steps necessary to prepare the Air Force officer, then ACSC should investigate its program to determine if similar deficiencies exist for the Army students and make appropriate changes to its course.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Air Force Student Class Roster and Information Sheet, CGSC Classes 1977-78, 1978-79, 1979-80 on file with the Air Force Section, Fort Leavenworth: Command and General Staff College.
2. Air University, "Air University Catalog", Maxwell AFB: Air University, 1978-79.
3. Air University, "Curriculum Plan/Circular", Maxwell AFB: Air Command and Staff College, August 21, 1978-June 8, 1979.
4. Baily, C.W., "Senior Professional Schools: The Air Force and Business Approaches", Maxwell AFB: Air War College, May, 1976.
5. Geller, Selwyn G., "An Annotated Bibliography of AWC & ACSC Students Research Studies from the Classes 1967 through 1974 on Professional Military Education", Maxwell AFB: Air Command and Staff College, May, 1975.
6. Hannon, C.W. and others, "Graduate Education within the Armed Forces", Carlisle Barracks: U.S. Army War College, May, 1974.
7. Korb, Lawrence J., ed., The System for Educating Military Officers in the U.S., Pittsburg: International Studies Association, 1976.
8. Reid, A.T. and others, "How Should the Requirements for Senior Professional Military Education be Determined To Assure Optimum Advantage to the United States Air Force?", Maxwell AFB: Air War College, May, 1966.
9. Roysdon, Douglas A., "An Investigation of the Effectiveness of the Air War College in Preparing its Graduates for High Level Command and Staff Responsibilities", Maxwell AFB: Air War College, 1967.
10. Smith, Robert G., The Engineering of Educational and Training Systems, Lexington: D.C. Heath and Company, 1971.
11. Statements by Air Force Officers, CGSC Class 1979-80,

Personal Interviews, Fort Leavenworth, Kansas,  
September-November, 1979.

12. Statements by Air Force Officers, CGSC Classes 1977-78, 1978-79, Personal Interviews, Fort Leavenworth, Kansas, February-April, 1980.
13. Statements by Air Force Officers, CGSC Class 1979-80, Personal Interviews, Fort Leavenworth, Kansas, March-April, 1980.
14. U.S. Air Force, AFM 1-1: Functions and Basic Doctrine of the United States Air Force, Washington: HQ USAF/XOX, February 14, 1979.
15. U.S. Army, "Administrative Information for Officer Students", Fort Leavenworth: Command and General Staff College, 1979.
16. U.S. Army, "1979-80 Catalog", Fort Leavenworth: Command and General Staff College, 1979.
17. U.S. Army, "Special Bibliography Number 34", Fort Leavenworth: Command and General Staff College, August, 1973.
18. U.S. Army, "Student Handbook 1979-80", Fort Leavenworth: Command and General Staff College, July, 1979.
19. Virant, Richard A., "Recognition of Scholastic Achievement: The Distinguished Graduate", Maxwell AFB: Air War College, May, 1976.

INITIAL DISTRIBUTION LIST

1. Dr. Donald D. Schaffer  
413 Waterford Street  
Apartment 215  
Edinboro, Pa. 16412
2. Defense Documentation Center  
Cameron Station  
Alexandria, Virginia 22314
3. Major Joseph R. Bream  
Air Force Section  
U.S. Army Command and General Staff College  
Fort Leavenworth, Kansas 66027
4. Library, U.S. Air Force Air Command and Staff College  
Maxwell Air Force Base, Alabama 36112
5. Library, U.S. Army Command and General Staff College  
Bell Hall  
Fort Leavenworth, Kansas 66027
6. LTC Barry B. Bridger  
Air Force Section  
U.S. Army Command and General Staff College  
Fort Leavenworth, Kansas 66027
7. University Microfilms  
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106